HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

These words of Psalm 56: 11 with which General Montgomery closed an address to his men during the Normandy campaign in World War II: *In God have I put my trust; I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Almighty God, as we begin each new day may we put our trust in Thee and focus our minds and hearts upon those horizons which are far beyond all fear and foreboding, all anxiety and anguish.

Give us those inner moral and spiritual certainties and composures which are the priceless possession of all who have found that Thou art their refuge and strength, a very present help in time of trouble.

Inspire us to feel that it is our deepest need and highest joy to enshrine Thy spirit and to have Thy divine guidance in our lives and in all our human affairs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence from the city of a good many Members, we were unable to get signatures on a minority report on the Defense Education Act. I ask unanimous consent that members of the committee may have until midnight tonight to file additional minority views on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee would yield briefly in order that I may inquire of the majority leader as to the program.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend asked that question.

In addition to what is already on the program for this week I want to announce so the Members may be alerted that the water pollution conference report will come up on Thursday next.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 2206.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations as to when we would start the regular schedule of detailed hearings on the aid money bill. In that connection, I think I should say that if the administration, through manipulation and the substituting of imagination for facts, or by other means, should succeed in getting the type of authorization being sought, there would not be a great deal of need for detailed hearings on the part of our committee. So, we will have to wait for further developments before we can prepare the schedule of hearings or even prepare ourselves for conducting the hearings, which if the proposed authorization is approved would, in fact, be somewhat of a mockery of budgetary procedure and the orderly appropriations process.

OUTER MONGOLIA AND RED CHINA

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after President Kennedy's return from his European jaunt, we heard an agreement was made with Mr. Macmillan for the admission of Red China into the United Nations and possibly its recognition by the United States. And that Mr. Kennedy had indicated to Mr. Macmillan that "it would take about a year to prepare the American people." Within the last few days we have heard of moves by the administration to obtain the recognition of Outer Mongolia on the basis that it is needed for a listening post, among other things. If the CIA and the other Government intelligence agencies cannot get information out of there, there is something wrong and something ought to be done to improve them. The answer to the intelligence problem is not in recognizing Outer Mongolia. On the other hand such recognition would establish a precedent to use the same specious arguments, for admission of its neighbor, Red China, to the U.N. and possibly diplomatic recognition.

In other words, this has the appearance of a two-step procedure, "to prepare the American people" in order to carry out the secret Kennedy-Macmillan agreement, if, indeed, there was one. I think the American people are entitled to object to it right now before any step is taken in this backward direction.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FORFEITURE OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS IN CASES OF OFFENSES INVOLVING THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 361, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6141) to amend the Act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6141, a bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 6141 would continue in full force and effect the prohibitions now contained in the act of September 1, 1954, against payment of any Federal annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of any individual who has committed an

offense involving the national security of the United States.

However, the legislation would restore certain Federal retirement benefits which, under the existing provisions of the act, have been denied to a number of individuals not because of the commission of offenses involving the national security, but because of the commission of comparatively minor offenses which are in no way related to the national security.

The act of 1954, in its entirety and as now in effect, contains provisions which exceed its original purpose and have resulted in the denial of Federal retirement benefits to certain individuals and their survivors for reasons which are not related to the primary purpose of such act.

H.R. 6141 will remedy this situation by providing for the restoration of Federal retirement benefits to those who have been deprived of such benefits on account of offenses other than offenses involving the national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 361 in order that the House can consider the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

As the gentleman from Arkansas has well explained, this resolution makes in order, under 1 hour of debate and an open rule, the consideration of H.R. 6141, which is a bill to amend, and perhaps correct, some of the provisions of the so-called Hiss Act dealing with the cancellation of Government retirement pay of certain persons.

This bill would confine the loss of retirement and other benefits to those cases involving national security. It is my understanding, through the hearings held by the Rules Committee, that this measure was considered very thoroughly by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; that a great deal of testimony was taken; and a number of cases were found where injustices had been worked, even on some of our great war heroes, as a result of the present law. The committee unanimously reported this bill favorably for the purpose of correcting the present law, yet to still protect the American people from those who engage in subversive activities and to punish them through loss of their retirement benefits.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6141 to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6141 with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, this legislation H.R. 6141, is identical to H.R. 4601, 86th Congress, which passed the House by a voice vote on April 14, 1959, but was not acted on by the other body. This legislation was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—as was H.R. 4601 in the last Congress—and is strongly endorsed by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, which submitted the official administration report urging enactment of H.R. 6141.

This legislation accomplishes two major purposes.

First, it continues and strengthens the prohibition against payment of any Federal retirement benefits to any person convicted of an offense against the national security, now contained in Public Law 769, 83d Congress—known as the Alger Hiss Act.

The denial of Federal retirement benefits to disloyal persons is strengthened in a number of important respects by this measure.

Section 2 of Public Law 769—the section declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Court of Claims in the case of Steinberg against United States—is replaced by a new section 2 recommended by the Department of Justice to overcome the weakness which resulted in the court's decision. The new section 2 prohibits payment of any Federal retirement benefits to a person who refuses to testify before a duly constituted judicial or congressional authority in a matter affecting the national security.

The Department of Justice informed our committee that it would be useless to petition for a writ of certiorari in the Steinberg case because such a writ undoubtedly would be denied while section 2 of Public Law 769 remains in its present state. The Department further recommended that all provisions of Public Law 769 relating to security offenses be strengthened to place the Department in a position to successfully sustain the denial of Federal retirement benefits in cases involving disloyalty and other security offenses.

These recommendations of the Department of Justice are placed in effect by language overcoming the constitutional and certain other objections raised by the court in the Steinberg case and by replacing the remaining security provisions of Public Law 769 with far clearer, more definitive, and more accurate language spelling out the firm congressional intent that no Federal retirement benefits shall be paid to any person convicted of an offense against the national security.

For example, this bill spells out in precise detail, by specific reference to appropriate penal and related provisions, that Federal retirement benefits shall not be paid in the case of any security offense set forth in the Internal Security Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and the Criminal Code of the United States. It provides similar denial of benefits for security offenses covered by statutes for the same general purposes which preceded those named.

The official report of Deputy Attorney General Byron R. White on H.R. 6141, submitted on June 14, 1961, contains the following statement:

> It is the view of the Department of Justice that the bill would, by clarifying existing law and by specifying additional provisions of law relating to security and loyalty the violation of which would be covered by the act, materially strengthen Public Law 769 in denying retirement pay to those who have committed offenses detrimental to national security.

When the bill that became Public Law 769 was being considered in 1954, the chief concern was to prevent payment of a civil service retirement annuity to Alger Hiss, who then was about to be released from a Federal penitentiary after serving a term for perjury in a matter involving subversive activities. It may be of interest that Alger Hiss had 17 years, 3½ months, of Federal service, and well might be eligible for an annuity when he reaches age 62 on November 11, 1966, except for this legislation. It is at best doubtful that he could be denied an annuity under existing law. To prevent such gross miscarriage of justice as payment of Federal annuities to Alger Hiss and his like, enactment of H.R. 6141 is necessary.

The second purpose of this legislation is to correct certain harsh injustices that have resulted from Public Law 769. That law contains a number of far-reaching provisions which have denied retirement benefits to individuals and innocent survivors because of comparatively minor offenses in no way related to the national security. Such provisions were not, and are not, needed to accomplish the principal purpose of denying retirement benefits in cases of offenses against the national security. In fact, they are harmful to such principal purpose because they link the innocent—as to security offenses—with the guilty by fixing the same heavy penalty for both regardless of the vast difference in measure of guilt.

H.R. 6141 eliminates these unnecessary and objectionable additional prohibitions which have nothing to do with national security and restores the rights to Federal retirement benefits previously denied thereunder. Thus, the legisla-

tion will permit payments of annuities and of retired pay in accordance with the existing laws authorizing such payments in the cases of individuals whose offenses do not involve the national security.

In summary, this legislation will carry out the primary objective of Public Law 769—that is, that no Federal annuity or retired pay shall be paid on the basis of the service of any individual guilty of a penal offense, act, or omission involving the national security—but will restore historic retirement rights in other cases which do not involve the national security.

H.R. 6141, in our judgment and that of the Department of Justice, should stand any court test since its prohibition is limited to offenses against the national security. Payment of Federal retirement benefits to offenders in such cases would be shocking to the public conscience and is diametrically opposed to the high principles on which our Government is founded.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge enactment of H.R. 6141 to strengthen our national security policy and to do equity to those persons who now face loss of earned retirement benefits although they have never committed an offense against the national security.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of the bill H.R. 6141, which was unanimously approved by that committee. I believe that most of the Members of the House are familiar with this legislation which passed the House last year and was not acted upon in the Senate.

The situation which this bill will correct is as follows:

As originally designed the legislation prevented the payment of pensions or annuities to people who were guilty of acts of subversion or disloyalty to the Government of these United States, but unfortunately the language of the law was so interpreted that many persons who had committed only minor violations of the law were given what amounted to a double penalty. First, they were penalized by the court with imprisonment or fines for their acts; second, they themselves, and all their beneficiaries, suffered the additional penalty of losing their pension rights under the laws of this Government. In order to prevent the double punishment this bill has been introduced and we hope will pass here today. At the same time the bill does make clear, and in all respects does place more stringent restrictions, against paying pensions to people who have been guilty of disloyalty to the Government. Consequently, we can very definitely recommend its prompt passage.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is well to point out another thing that the constitutional argument that some people not entirely informed might raise against this bill is entirely clarified by the fact that a person who has paid money into the fund will get that money back.

Nothing in this legislation would prevent a person who is deprived of a pension from the United States from getting back the money that they themselves paid in. What it does prevent is that individual who is guilty of subversion from getting additional funds paid into the retirement fund by the Government itself.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly can recommend this bill to the Committee and to the whole House, and I hope that it is passed. I hope also that the Senate will act upon it promptly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman in the statement he has made in behalf of this bill. I am sure the gentleman will recall that when this bill was considered in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1954 we had some very serious reservations concerning the implications of it. Those defects have now been corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be passed by the House.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman for that statement, and for pointing out to the Members of the House that he and I, who are usually so wrong, were right for once.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose and the general effect of this legislation have been most ably explained by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. My remarks will be directed to the very great importance of the security considerations.

As chairman of the subcommittees which developed this legislation in the 87th Congress, and the identical bill in the 86th Congress, and as a member of the subcommittee that acted on the original legislation in the 83d Congress, my chief concern has been with the establishment of a firm legislative directive that no retirement benefits shall be paid on the basis of Federal service by any person convicted of an offense against the national security.

Certainly, it is repugnant to the high ethical and moral principles, and to the system of laws, on which our free society is founded that the Government of the United States ever could be placed under obligation to pay 1 cent of the taxpayers' money as retirement benefits to any person who commits an offense against the national security.

For one thing, it is to be recognized that the Federal payments of retirement benefits with which we are dealing in this legislation are largely in the nature of gratuities. The prohibition in this bill applies principally to money which otherwise would come out of the taxpayers' pockets, rather than money contributed or paid in by the persons involved.

This legislation will provide the clear and positive affirmation of national policy that we have needed and intended to establish with respect to the fundamental facts and issues which not only justify but require denial of such gratuities to traitors.

Viciously hostile policies and attitudes by foreign communistic powers constantly threaten our existence as a sovereign nation. One of their chief objectives is to infiltrate our Government with subversive influences to undermine and overthrow the Government. What conceivable grounds could there be to aid and abet these hostile purposes by permitting payment from the public treasury of gratuities in the form of retirement benefits to persons convicted of offenses that show them to be Communists or fellow travelers?

Overriding considerations of national security and public necessity require the writing into our statute books of a firm proscription against payment at the expense of American taxpayers of retirement benefits based on service of any person whose acts or omissions endanger the security of the United States.

H.R. 6141 will accomplish this essential purpose. Nothing less will serve.

There is serious doubt that the most significant principle involved in this legislation has been given all due consideration in the interpretation and application of existing law. This principle is beyond argument—that one who accepts public office assumes all of the obligations of the office, both explicit and implicit. When one enters the service of the United States he imposes upon himself an absolute commitment of complete and unswerving loyalty—an obligation that is preemptive of all rights and benefits attached to his public service. Fulfillment of this obligation of loyalty at all times is a condition precedent to the granting of any right or benefit arising out of the office.

Breach of this high obligation and trust by an act or omission which impairs the national security abrogates from the beginning any rights of office and any obligation of the United States to grant benefits related to the office. All claims for such benefits fall with failure of complete loyalty. To permit a different result would be to strike at the very foundations of our free society and our democratic form of government.

There is no ground, in reason or law, for a theory that the denial of benefits provided by this legislation is a form of punishment. The bill neither adds to nor changes any existing provision of law defining criminal offenses and prescribing penalties for such offenses. It merely spells out by statute what already is implicit in the law with respect to obligations attendant upon the acceptance of public office and the conditions attached to the granting of any benefits or emoluments from such office.

Nor is there substance for the proposition that the bill will deny any right

without due process or will inflict punishment without prior appropriate judicial proceedings. This legislation has no effect in the nature of trial and conviction. It makes no provision for any determination that a penal offense has or has not been committed. The bill will become operative only after the fact that the offense occurred has been duly established by a trial and conviction, or otherwise by a duly constituted judicial or legislative tribunal, pursuant to other existing law.

It is to be emphasized, also, that this bill is not a mere limition on the use of appropriated moneys. It constitutes an absolute and permanent bar to payment of Federal retirement benefits under the stipulated conditions. It makes any right or claim for such benefits null and void from the beginning.

The bill operates to divest any person who comes within its bar of benefits to which he otherwise might be entitled but which he has relinquished irrevocably by breach of the first condition of his Federal service—that is, his initial agreement that he will never act against the interests of the United States and will never fail to act when it is his duty to act in support of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly concur in the unanimous recommendation of our committee that this legislation be approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. There is one point that comes to my mind in reading this bill and the report, and understanding the people and the organizations that have approved this bill, in view of the fact that the main case that we tried to get at some years ago in this legislation was Alger Hiss, yet, Alger Hiss was not convicted of a violation of the security of the United States, he was convicted of perjury. Will that validate his pension under this act?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. No, indeed. That act itself provides, and the gentleman will see in the hearings, beginning on page 3, the act itself provides that no benefits shall be payable to any person where perjury has been committed under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes any of the offenses within the purview of any provision of law specified or described in paragraph 1 of this subsection. That specifically takes care of that situation.

Mr. BECKER. I might say to the gentleman, I wanted him to bring that point out. But, in the bill under that subsection, it is not quite as clear as it is in the report.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. The bill is rather lengthy.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but it does not bring it out as clearly in the bill that we are going to pass here as it does in the report. That is the point I have in mind.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I am convinced, after going through the hearings and after hearing from the experts on this particular legislation, that it does completely take care of the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the legislation will receive the favorable consideration of this Committee and of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] in support of the bill H.R. 6141, amending the act of September 1, 1954, which would limit to cases involving the national security of the United States the prohibition against former employees of the Government receiving annuities or pensions. This is a noncontroversial bill. As has been pointed out, it was reported out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by unanimous vote. In fact, a similar measure was approved by this body in 1959 and died for failure of action in the other body before the adjournment of the 86th Congress. It was the original intent of this act of September 1, 1954, which became Public Law 769, that we would primarily get at cases involving disloyalty or acts affecting the national security of the United States. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee of the 83d Congress that acted on this original legislation. I can assure you that the objective we primarily had in mind was to get at cases similar to the act committed by Alger Hiss. We did not intend for it to be as far reaching as it has turned out to be and to cause so much hardship to employees of the Federal Government and, for that matter, members and employees of the military services.

Let me make it clear that none of the members of the committee who support this legislation condones any misdeed by employees of the Government, regardless of how minor the offense. There are, however, other forms of punishment for these misdeeds which are administered by the courts and many administrative agencies. Having been once punished and having paid their debt to society it seems like an unreasonable hardship to work on them to take away a pension they had earned, possibly over a period of 40 years. It is really comparable to double jeopardy; it is merely compounding the punishment.

I have a couple of cases I wish to bring to your attention of employees who were punished for their misdeeds but afterward continued in the employ of the Government. One case involved a postal employee who was convicted on July 24, 1936, for obstructing and removing, as a postal service employee, letters intended to be conveyed through the post office. Thereafter, the man had other Government employment for a short period before entering on duty at the Naval Weapons Plant, from which he was retired for disability on June 23, 1960. Thus, he was employed from 1920 to 1960, or 40 years, in various Government work. Upon his retirement, he was refused a pension, although he had paid his debt for his 1936 crime by the sentence imposed at that time. He is now without any visible means of support. He is unable to work.

I have here another case involving a chief warrant officer of the Marine Corps, who was convicted in 1952 of stealing about $500 from the Marine Corps Exchange at El Toro, Calif. The court-martial fined him $750 and also 1,000 numbers in rank. Thus, he paid the penalty as any other citizen for his crime.

He retired in 1954, and received pension until his case was reviewed in 1960, at which time his pension was revoked and proceedings instituted to reclaim some $20,000 that already had been paid to him. He has been seriously ill, and has no means of support, except what his wife can bring home. He has four dependents, in addition to his wife.

In these two cases where these crimes or misdeeds were committed, the people were convicted and paid for their misdeeds, were punished for them, but were allowed to continue to work for the Federal Government or in the military service. I maintain if any misdeed is so serious that it would bar an employee or serviceman his annuity or his pension, then he should not be permitted to work for the Federal Government or to remain in the military service. On the contrary, any employee who commits an act involving the national security of the United States or an act of disloyalty toward his country should certainly be denied his pension and by all means should not be permitted to remain in the service of the Government.

In the case of disloyalty or acts involving the national security there are provisions in the law that prohibit such persons from remaining in Government service. This legislation we are considering today continues to deny the right to annuity or pension to people who have committed crimes of that sort; so it does not weaken the original intent of the legislation whatsoever.

We hope we will have the unanimous support of this body in approving this legislation.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the original drafters of a bill at the time of the conviction of Alger Hiss. My opinion was then and my opinion now is that this legislation should be directed to specific cases. Unfortunately, during the drafting of the various bills and also during the hysteria on the part of many people throughout the country, we got a little bit carried away and covered far too much territory.

As a result, there are 165 cases which properly should never have come under this kind of legislation. The legislation is aimed specifically at people who have been disloyal—some have been traitors—to the United States, and on that it is perfectly obvious, as has been well said by the chairman of our committee, by the

ranking member and by other speakers here today, there can be no possibility and no shadow of a doubt.

On the other hand, during the working of this law since it was passed in 1954, there have been grave, even tragic, injustices. Some of these cases have been read, and at random I just happened to pick out this one which I would like to cite to you.

A janitor at the Sacramento, Calif., Signal Depot, died in service in October 1957, leaving a widow and two small children. He had previously served from 1944 to 1947 with the Department of the Army and while so employed was arrested for theft of a package from the Herlong, Calif., post office. He was indicted, pleaded guilty, and was convicted of theft of mail. He was removed from the Federal job, and the court placed him on probation for 2 years. His probation record was good and in 1950 was rehired in the Federal service and continued so employed until death. His offense had not been serious enough to warrant imprisonment. He had paid the penalty imposed, had been rehired by the Government and served honorably for 7 years. Yet Public Law 769 operated to deny his innocent widow and children survivor annuities otherwise payable, worth $23,000.

This legislation corrects such a case, and at the same time it in no way mitigates offenses of those people who have deliberately plotted and worked for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

I am very sure there will be a unanimous vote of this House to pass this legislation which corrects the abuses but which imposes no further hardship, which in many ways is more than generous to the offender, in that it gives back all of his own money that he may have put into the fund. I can assure the membership of the House that is far more than would be done today in any other country of the world, this side or the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes", approved September 1, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1142, 70 Stat. 761; 5 U.S.C. 2281–2288), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) there shall not be paid to any person convicted prior to, on or after September 1, 1954, under any article or provision of law specified or described in this subsection, of any offense within the purview of such article or provision to the extent provided in this subsection, or to any survivor or beneficiary of such person so convicted, for any period subsequent to the date of such conviction or subsequent to September 1, 1954, whichever date is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay—

"(1) any offense within the purview of—

"(A) section 792 (harboring or concealing persons), 793 (gathering, transmitting, or losing defense information), 794 (gathering or delivering defense information to aid foreign government), or 798 (disclosure of classified information), of chapter 37 (relating to espionage and censorship) of title 18 of the United States Code,

"(B) chapter 105 (relating to sabotage) of title 18 of the United States Code,

"(C) section 2381 (treason), 2382 (misprison of treason), 2383 (rebellion or insurrection), 2384 (seditious conspiracy), 2385 (advocating overthrow of government), 2387 (activities affecting armed forces generally), 2388 (activities affecting armed forces during war), 2389 (recruiting for service against United States), or 2390 (enlistment to serve against United States), of chapter 115 (relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of title 18 of the United States Code,

"(D) section 10(b)(2), 10(b)(3), or 10(b)(4) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 766, 767; 42 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 1810 (b)(2), (3) and (4), as in effect prior to the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 919; Public Law 703, Eighty-third Congress; 42 U.S.C. 2011–2281),

"(E) section 16(a) or 16(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 773; 42 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 1816 (a) and (b)) as in effect prior to the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the Act of August 30, 1954, insofar as such offense under such section 16(a) or 16(b) is committed with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, or

"(F) any prior provision of law on which any provision of law specified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of this paragraph is based;

"(2) any offense within the purview of—

"(A) article 104 (aiding the enemy) or article 106 (spies) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (chapter 47 of title 10 of the United States Code) or any prior article on which such article 104 or article 106, as the case may be, is based, or

"(B) any current article of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (or any prior article on which such current article is based) not specified or described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph on the basis of charges and specifications describing a violation of any provision of law specified or described in paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of this subsection if the executed sentence includes death, dishonorable discharge, or dismissal from the service, or if the defendant dies before execution of such sentence as finally approved;

"(3) perjury committed under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia—

"(A) in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes any of the offenses—

"(i) within the purview of any provision of law specified or described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or

"(ii) within the purview of any article or provision of law specified or described in paragraph (2) of this subsection insofar as such offense is within the purview of any article or provision of law specified or described in paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) (A) of this subsection,

"(B) in falsely testifying before any Federal grand jury, court of the United States, or court-martial with respect to his service as an officer or employee of the Government in connection with any matter involving or relating to any interference with or endangerment of, or involving or relating to any plan or attempt to interfere with or endanger, the national security or defense of the United States, or

"(C) in falsely testifying before any congressional committee in connection with any matter under inquiry before such congressional committee involving or relating to any interference with or endangerment of, or involving or relating to any plan or attempt to interfere with or endanger, the national security or defense of the United States; and

"(4) subornation of perjury committed in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another person as specified in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

"(b) There shall not be paid to any person convicted, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this amendment, under any article or provision of law specified or described in this subsection, of any offense within the purview of such article or provision to the extent provided in this subsection, or to any survivor or beneficiary of such person so convicted, for any period subsequent to the date of such conviction or subsequent to the date of enactment of this amendment, whichever date is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay—

"(1) Any offense within the purview of—

"(A) section 222 (violation of specific sections) or section 223 (violation of sections generally of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 958; 42 U.S.C. 2272 and 2273) insofar as such offense under such section 222 or 223 is committed with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation,

"(B) section 224 (communication of restricted data), section 225 (receipt of restricted data), or section 226 (tampering with restricted data) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 958 and 959; 42 U.S.C. 2274, 2275, and 2276), or

"(C) section 4 (conspiracy and communication or receipt of classified information), section 112 (conspiracy or evasion of apprehension during internal security emergency), or section 113 (aiding evasion of apprehension during internal security emergency) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 991, 1029, and 1030; 50 U.S.C. 783, 822, and 823);

"(2) any offense within the purview of any current article of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (chapter 47 of title 10 of the United States Code), or any prior article on which such current article is based, on the basis of charges and specifications describing a violation of any provision of law specified or described in paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of this subsection, if the executed sentence includes death, dishonorable discharge, or dismissal from the service, or if the defendant dies before execution of such sentence as finally approved;

"(3) perjury committed under the laws of the United States or the District of Columbia in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes any of the offenses within the purview of any provision of law specified or described in paragraph (1) of this subsection; and

"(4) subornation of perjury committed in connection with the false denial of another person as specified in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

"SEC. 2. (a) There shall not be paid to any person who, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, has refused or refuses, or knowingly and willfully has failed or fails, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document, relating to his service as an officer or employee of

the Government, before a Federal grand jury, court of the United States, court-martial, or congressional committee, in any proceeding with respect to—

"(1) any relationship which he has had or has with a foreign government, or

"(2) any matter involving or relating to any interference with or endangerment of, or involving or relating to any plan or attempt to interfere with or endanger, the national security or defense of the United States,

or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, for any period subsequent to September 1, 1954, or subsequent to the date of such failure or refusal of such person, whichever date is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay.

"(b) There shall not be paid to any person who, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, knowingly and willfully, has made or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or who, prior to, on, or after such date, knowingly and willfully, has concealed or conceals any material fact, with respect to his—

"(1) past or present membership in, affiliation or association with, or support of the Communist Party, or any chapter, branch, or subdivision thereof, in or outside the United States, or any other organization, party, or group advocating (A) the overthrow, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, of the Government of the United States. (B) the establishment, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the United States, or (C) the right to strike against the Government of the United States,

"(2) conviction, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (a) to the extent provided in such subsection, or

"(3) failure or refusal to appear, and testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document, as specified in subsection (a) of this section,

for any period subsequent to September 1, 1954, or subsequent to the date on which any such statement, representation, or concealment of fact is made or occurs, whichever date is later, in any document executed by such person in connection with his employment in, or application for, a civilian or military office or position in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay.

"(c) There shall not be paid to any person who, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this amendment, knowingly and willfully, has made or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or who, prior to, on, or after such date, knowingly and willfully, has concealed or conceals any material fact, with respect to his conviction, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (b) to the extent provided in such subsection, for any period subsequent to the date of enactment of this amendment or subsequent to the date on which any such statement, representation, or concealment of fact is made or occurs, whichever date is later, in any document executed by such person in connection with his employment in, or application for, a civilian or military office or position in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay.

"SEC. 3. There shall not be paid to any person—

"(1) who (A) after July 31, 1956, is under indictment, or has outstanding against him charges preferred under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, for any offense within the purview of subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, or (B) after the date of enactment of this amendment, is under indictment, or has outstanding against him charges preferred under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, for any offense within the purview of subsection (b) of such first section, and

"(2) who willfully remains outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a period in excess of one year with knowledge of such indictment or charges, as the case may be,

for any period subsequent to the end of such one-year period, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in section 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay, unless and until—

"(i) a nolle prosequi to the entire indictment is entered upon the record, or such charges have been dismissed by competent authority, as the case may be,

"(ii) such person returns and thereafter the indictment, or charges, is or are dismissed, or

"(iii) after trial by court or court-martial, as applicable, the accused is found not guilty of the offense or offenses referred to in paragraph (1) of this section.

"SEC. 4. (a) In the case of—

"(1) the conviction of any person, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (a) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by any person of any violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 2 of this Act, or

"(2) the conviction of any person, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (b) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by any person of any violation of subsection (c) of section 2 of this Act,

any amounts (not including employment taxes) contributed by such person toward an annuity the benefits of which are denied under this Act (less any amounts previously refunded or previously paid as annuity benefits) shall be refunded, upon appropriate application therefor—

"(A) to such person,

"(B) if such person is deceased, to such other person or persons as may be designated to receive refunds by or under the law, regulation, or agreement under which the annuity (the benefits of which are denied under this Act) would have been payable, or

"(C) if there is no such designation, in the order of precedence prescribed in section 11(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (70 Stat. 755; 5 U.S.C. 2261(c)) or section 2771 of title 10 of the United States Code, as applicable.

"(b) Each refund under subsection (a) of this section shall be made with interest at such rates and for such periods as may be provided under the law, regulation, or agreement under which the annuity would have been payable. Such interest shall not be computed—

"(1) if paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section is applicable, for any period after the date of conviction or commission of violation, as the case may be, or after September 1, 1954, whichever date is later, or

"(2) if paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section is applicable, for any period after the date of conviction or commission of violation, as the case may be, or after the date of enactment of this amendment, whichever date is later.

"(c) No person whose annuity is denied under this Act shall be required to repay that part of any annuity otherwise properly paid to such person which is in excess of the aggregate amount of his own contributions toward such annuity, with applicable interest.

"(d) No survivor or beneficiary of any such person shall be required to repay that part of any annuity otherwise properly paid to such person or to such survivor or beneficiary on the basis of the service of such person which is in excess of the aggregate amount of the contributions of such person toward annuity, with applicable interest.

"SEC. 5. (a) No person (including an eligible beneficiary under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code or under section 5 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 504; 37 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. III, sec. 374)) to whom payment of retired pay is denied under this Act shall be required to refund to the United States any retired pay otherwise properly paid to such person or beneficiary which is paid in violation of this Act.

"(b) In the case of the conviction of, or the commission of any violation by, any person to the extent provided in paragraph (1) or paragraph (2), as the case may be, of section 4(a) of this Act, any deposits made under section 1438 of chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code, or under section 5 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 504; 37 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. III, sec. 374), to provide the eligible beneficiary with annuity for any period (less amounts previously paid as retired pay benefits) shall be refunded, upon appropriate application therefor, in accordance with such section 4(a), with interest as provided in section 4(b) of this Act.

"SEC. 6. (a) The right to receive an annuity or retired pay shall be deemed restored to any person convicted, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, of an offense which is within the purview of the first section of this Act or which constitutes a violation of section 2 of this Act, for which he is denied under this Act an annuity or retired pay, to whom a pardon of such offense is granted by the President of the United States, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, and to the survivor or beneficiary of such person. Such restoration of the right to receive an annuity or retired pay shall be effective as of the date on which such pardon is granted. Any amounts refunded to such person under section 4 or section 5(b) of this Act shall be redeposited before credit is allowed for the period or periods of service covered by the refund. No payment of annuity or retired pay shall be made, by virtue of such pardon, for any period prior to the date on which such pardon is granted.

"(b) The President is authorized to restore, effective as of such date as he may prescribe, the right to receive an annuity or retired pay to any person who is denied, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, an annuity or retired pay under section 2 of this Act, and to the survivor or beneficiary of such person. Any amounts refunded to such person under section 4 or section 5(b) of this Act shall be redeposited before credit is allowed for the period or periods of serv-

ice covered by the refund. No payment of annuity or retired pay shall be made, by virtue of such restoration of annuity or retired pay by the President under this subsection, for any period prior to the effective date of such restoration of annuity or retired pay.

"(c) The right to receive an annuity or retired pay shall not be denied because of any conviction of an offense which is within the purview of the first section of this Act or which constitutes a violation of section 2 of this Act, in any case in which it is established by satisfactory evidence that such conviction or violation resulted from proper compliance with orders issued, in a confidential relationship, by a department, agency, establishment, or other authority of any branch of the Government of the United States or of the Government of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 7. No accountable officer or employee of the Government shall be held responsible for any payment made in violation of any provision of this Act if such payment is made in due course and without fraud, collusion, or gross negligence.

"SEC. 8. (a) The President may—

"(1) drop from the rolls any member of the armed forces, and any member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service, who is deprived of retired pay under the provisions of this Act, and

"(2)(A) restore to any person so dropped from the rolls to whom retired pay is restored by reason of any provision of or change in this Act (including the provisions of section 2 of the Act which enacts this clause), his military status, and (B) restore to him and his beneficiaries all rights and privileges of which he or they were deprived by reason of his name having been dropped from the rolls.

"(b) If the person restored was a commissioned officer he may be reappointed by the President alone to the grade and position on the retired list which he held at the time his name was dropped from the rolls.

"SEC. 9. This Act shall not be construed to restrict any authority under any other provision of law to deny or withhold benefits authorized by law.

"SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'officer or employee of the Government' includes—

"(A) an officer or employee in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States;

"(B) a Member of, Delegate to, or Resident Commissioner in, the Congress of the United States;

"(C) an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia; and

"(D) a member or former member of the armed forces, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Public Health Service.

"(2) the term 'annuity' means any retirement benefit (including any disability insurance benefit and any dependent's or survivor's benefit under title II of the Social Security Act and any monthly annuity under section 2 or section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) payable by any department or agency of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia upon the basis of service as a civilian officer or employee of the Government and any other service which is creditable to an officer or employee of the Government toward such benefit under the law, regulation, or agreement providing such benefit, except that—

"(A) the term 'annuity' does not include any benefit provided under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

"(B) the term 'annuity' does not include salary or compensation which may not be diminished under section 1 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States;

"(C) the term 'annuity' does not include, in the case of a benefit payable under title II of the Social Security Act, so much of such benefit as would be payable without taking into account (for any of the purposes of such title II, including determinations of periods of disability under section 216(i)) any remuneration for service as an officer or employee of the Government;

"(D) the term 'annuity' does not include any monthly annuity awarded under section 2 or section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to the date of enactment of this amendment (whether or not computed under section 3(e) of such Act) and, in the case of any annuity awarded under such section 2 or 5 on or subsequent to the date of enactment of this amendment, does not include so much of such annuity as would be payable without taking into account any military service creditable under section 4 of such Act;

"(E) the term 'annuity' does not include any retirement benefit (including any disability insurance benefit and any dependent's or survivor's benefit under title II of the Social Security Act) of any person to whom such benefit has been awarded or granted prior to September 1, 1954, or of the survivor or beneficiary of such person, insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (a) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 2 of this Act; and

"(F) the term 'annuity' does not include any retirement benefit (including any disability insurance benefit and any dependent's or survivor's benefit under title II of the Social Security Act) of any person to whom such benefit has been awarded or granted prior to the date of enactment of this amendment, or of the survivor or beneficiary of such person, insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (b) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of subsection (c) of section 2 of this Act.

"(3) the term 'retired pay' means retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, payable under any law of the United States to members or former members of the armed forces, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and any annuity payable to an eligible beneficiary of any such member or former member under chapter 73 (annuities based on retired or retainer pay) of title 10 of the United States Code, or under section 5 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 504; 37 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. III, sec. 374), except that—

"(A) the term 'retired pay' does not include any benefit provided under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

"(B) the term 'retired pay', as applicable to retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, and equivalent pay, does not include any such pay of any person to whom such pay has been awarded or granted prior to September 1, 1954, insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (a) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 2 of this Act;

"(C) the term 'retired pay', as applicable to retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, does not include any such pay of any person to whom such pay has been awarded or granted prior to the date of enactment of this amendment insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, under any article or provision of law specified or described in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such subsection (b) to the extent provided in such subsection, or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of subsection (c) of section 2 of this Act; and

"(D) the term 'retired pay', as applicable to an annuity payable to the eligible beneficiary of any person under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code, or under section 5 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 504; 37 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. III, sec. 374), does not include any such annuity of any such beneficiary if such annuity has been awarded or granted to such beneficiary, or if retired pay has been awarded or granted to such person, prior to the date of enactment of this amendment insofar as concerns—

"(i) the conviction, prior to such date, of the person on the basis of whose service such annuity is awarded or granted, under any article or provision of law specified or described in the first section of this Act, of any offense within the purview of such first section to the extent specified in such section, or

"(ii) the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of section 2 of this Act.

"(4) the term 'armed forces' shall have the meaning provided for such term by title 10 of the United States Code.

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 12. (a) Section 3282 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to offenses (1) committed on or after September 1, 1954, or (2) committed prior to such date, if on such date prosecution therefore is not barred by provisions of law in effect prior to such date."

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to subsection (b) of this section, any person, including his survivor or beneficiary, to whom annuity or retired pay is not payable under the Act of September 1, 1954, as in effect at any time prior to the date of enactment of this Act, by reason of any conviction of an offense, any commission of a violation, any refusal to answer, or any absence under indictment, or under charges, for any offense, shall be restored the right to receive such annuity or retired pay for any and all periods for which he would have had the right to receive such annuity or retired pay if the Act of September 1, 1954, had not been enacted, unless, under the amendment made by the first section of this Act, such annuity or retired pay remains nonpayable to such person, including his survivor or beneficiary.

(b) No annuity accrued or accruing, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, on account of the restoration, by reason of the amendment made by the first section of this Act and by reason of subsection (a) of this section, of the right to receive such annuity, shall be paid until any sum refunded under section 3 of the Act of September 1, 1954, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of such amendment, is deposited or is collected by offset against the annuity.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6141) to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 361, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gnetleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LOTTERY OF ECUADOR

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the National Lottery of Ecuador. Like a number of other lotteries of Spanish-speaking nations, the Ecuadoran National Lottery exists not for the benefit of the general treasury but rather for the benefit of numerous charities.

In South America, lotteries support many hospitals, asylums, orphanages and the like that would be otherwise aided or maintained by the government. Ecuador is one of the nations in which the profits of the national lottery are directly channeled to these institutions.

In 1960, the gross receipts of Ecuador's lottery came to $3 million. One-third of this money, the entire profit, was turned over immediately to charitable organizations. The bulk of the money went to assist hospitals.

We here in America could benefit immeasurably if moneys that now flow into the pockets of gangsters could be diverted into a national lottery and utilized as are the profits of many foreign lotteries.

THE LATE SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today there was born one of the true statesmen, one of the great fighters for liberty and justice of our times, the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. I am proud to represent the First District of Nebraska where the home of Senator Norris is located at McCook, Nebr. I am proud to represent the State which provided for America this outstanding public servant and man of vision.

The Nation owes much to Senator Norris. It was through his ability to see our country's needs, both the present and future, that these needs have been met. It is largely through his efforts, his courage, his leadership, that our country has been able to meet the challenge of the 20th century.

When George W. Norris foresaw our Nation's farm families acquiring the good things of life through electric power brought to their homes, he was accused of being a visionary. In truth, he was a man of vision. But in addition, he had those fine qualities which enable a man to translate dreams into reality. He had a practical and knowledgeable approach to the fundamental problems involved. And, most of all, he had the courage to fight against any odds—and the odds against him in many cases were tremendous—until those dreams became reality.

When George Norris foresaw arid and semiarid miles of our Western and Plains States becoming a land of abundance, he again was accused of being a visionary. But again, and still against great odds, he battled for his ideals—and again through his courageous leadership, the goal was achieved—and adds to the luster of his name.

Senator Norris was a man who fought against injustice wherever he found it. In these halls of the House of Representatives he was a leader in bringing added democracy to the proceedings of the House. He and his band of supporters were able to win only because they were willing to fight with every breath in their bodies for that victory, inspired by Senator Norris himself.

He took with him to the Senate this same spirit and same ability to gather about him loyal and courageous men who were willing to stand up for a cause and for a principle.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced in the House two bills to commemorate George W. Norris' memory, one to change the name of the Lincoln Air Force Base to the George W. Norris Air Force Base, and the other to acquire for the Federal Government his last home and residence in McCook, Nebr., as a fitting shrine to his memory.

It was shortly after I introduced the first of these bills that I received a very touching letter from Mrs. Norris who still lives at the family home in McCook. In that letter, Mrs. Norris said in part:

> Sincerely do I thank you for your interest in having the Lincoln Air Force base renamed for my husband—it touched me deeply.

She goes on to describe her husband as one of the "brave men in the fight for the development of our vital natural resources. Just now our country needs men—like my husband."

Mr. Speaker, in these days which try men's souls—in a time when the faith of the free world in the traditions and institutions of democracy is shaken—in these days when even some of our own citizens are questioning the course our Nation is following—in times like these we do, indeed, need men like George W. Norris.

It is good for us at this time to reflect on such men who through their examples have provided the light by which to guide the footsteps of the future.

IMMIGRATION OF ALIEN ADOPTED CHILDREN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of a number of my colleagues in the House in the matter of immigration of alien children adopted by U.S. citizens, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the text of letters exchanged between Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Attorney General of the United States:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1,
> *Washington, D.C., June 27, 1961.*
>
> Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
> *The Attorney General,*
> *U.S. Department of Justice,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This subcommittee has considered the advisability of legislation which would extend administrative operations authorized pursuant to section 4(a) of the act of September 11, 1957, as amended, under which special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to certain eligible orphans adopted abroad by a U.S. citizen and spouse, or coming to the United States for adoption. You are, of course, aware that the law expires on June 30, 1961.
>
> I wish to advise you that our conclusion was not to recommend to the House at this time legislation which would continue the above-cited law.
>
> This subcommittee believes that the provisions of section 101(b)(1)(E) in conjunction with section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act offer a satisfactory solution in equitable situations where the separation of the alien adopted child and the American family should be prevented. It is, therefore, suggested that you utilize the discretionary authority vested in you pursuant to section 212(d)(5), supra, and authorize the paroling into the United States of such

children who, in your opinion, would fall within the purview of paragraph (E) of section 101(b)(1), supra, after they would have remained in the custody of the adopting parent or parents for at least 2 years. It is believed that in accordance with congressional intent evidence in several past enactments on this subject, the following two classes of alien children could be paroled into the United States for the purpose of benefiting prospectively under the nonquota provisions of the law above cited:

(1) Orphans adopted abroad by a U.S. citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the U.S. Armed Forces, or is employed by the U.S. Government, or is temporarily abroad on business and where provisions of paragraph (E), supra, do not provide administrative remedy at the time the adopting parent or parents transfer from the country in which adoption occurred; and

(2) Orphans selected by a U.S. citizen and spouse stationed abroad under the circumstances and for the purposes stated in paragraph (1), above, where (a) foreign adoption proceedings have not been instituted or have not been completed, and (b) the adopting parents have given you the proper assurances that they will adopt such orphan in the United States and that the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State of such orphan's proposed residence have been met.

This subcommittee feels that in the case of orphans described in paragraph (1), above, parole entry under section 212(d)(5), supra, could occur at any time while the child is under 14 years of age.

However, it is felt that in order to allow for a reasonable period of time to complete adoption in the United States and thereby make it possible for the children to derive nonquota status under section 101(b)(1)(E), supra, in the case of orphans entering under parole pursuant to paragraph (2) above, the age limit should be lower, possibly 12 years of age.

An expression of your agreement to the suggestion herein outlined will be appreciated.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1961.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1,
Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of June 27, 1961, addressed to the Attorney General, setting forth the proposals of your committee in respect to the parole into the United States of certain adopted orphans after the expiration, on June 30, 1961, of the existing law on that subject.

The Department has submitted its report on H.R. 6300 and the purposes of that bill with respect to alien orphans are strongly endorsed. It is hoped that these provisions will eventually be enacted into permanent orphan legislation. In view of the statements in your letter, however, it appears unlikely that this or similar legislation in the alien orphan field will be passed in this session of the Congress.

Because of the lack of any current legislative authority for the admission of alien orphans, the Department of Justice is prepared to invoke the discretionary parole authority vested in the Attorney General under section 212(d)(5) to parole selected alien orphans into the United States "for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest." The exercise of that discretionary authority thereafter will continue until Congress has considered the various proposals on this subject and has enacted a positive law. The Department would consider it to be strictly in the public interest to authorize the entry of any alien orphan between whom and his adopting U.S. citizen parent and the latter's spouse the relationship of child and parent has been created by operation of foreign adoption laws on the personal application or petition of the adopting parents while physically present within the jurisdiction of the adoption tribunal. Additionally, there would be included any alien child for whom a U.S. citizen, abroad in the employ or in the service of the U.S. Government or temporarily abroad on business or pleasure, and his spouse has furnished assurances that the alien child will be adopted by them in the United States and that the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State of such orphan's proposed residence have been met. In both cases parole will be authorized only after investigation identical with that currently conducted under the provisions of the recently expired section 4(a) of the act of September 11, 1957.

After the expiration of 2 years from the decree of adoption, the child, if it has resided with the adopting parents during that period, will be eligible for nonquota status under section 101(b)(1)(E). The Department proposes to exercise the authority vested in the Attorney General under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to adjust the status of the child at that time to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Sincerely,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Census may sit during general debate next Tuesday and Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. TOLL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. KNOX.

(The following member (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SANTANGELO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 139. An act for the relief of Krste Angeloff;

S. 442. An act for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris);

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes;

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 576. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis;

S. 1720. An act to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world; and

S. 1931. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1120. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a classified document dated July 6, 1961; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1121. A letter from the Cochairmen, U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, transmitting the semiannual report of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO relating to accounting for all expenditures, pursuant to Public Law 86-719; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1122. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish an Advisory Board on Indian Affairs"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1123. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HIESTAND: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7904. A bill to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 674, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4945. A bill to set

aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2732. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that the Secretaries of the uniformed services shall prescribe a reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings upon permanent change of station of members of the uniformed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6597. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the crediting of certain minority service for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7724. A bill to provide for advances of pay to members of the armed services in cases of emergency evacuation of military dependents from oversea areas and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7864. A bill to dissolve Federal Facilities Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7935. A bill to restore authority in the Armed Forces to prepare the remains, on a reimbursable basis, of certain deceased dependents of military personnel and to transport the remains at Government expense to their homes or other appropriate place of interment; without amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7722. A bill to amend section 3579, title 10, United States Code, to provide that commissioned officers of the Medical Service Corps may exercise command outside the Army Medical Service when directed by proper authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2206. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 8073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend conservation reserve contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 8074. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 8075. A bill to provide for redistricting of any of the several States by the Director of the Bureau of the Census for the election of Representatives in Congress in certain cases in which the State fails to redistrict in the manner provided by the law thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 8076. A bill to establish an Advisory Board on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8077. A bill to put to more productive use idle Indian lands now in multiple ownership status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8078. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, 1962, with respect to freedom of navigation in international waterways; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 8079. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, 1962, with respect to racial or religious discrimination against American citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 8080. A bill to amend section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to freedom of navigation in international waterways; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 8081. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to racial or religious discrimination against American citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 8082. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 8083. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 8084. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8085. A bill to provide for the establishment under the National Science Foundation of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8086. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit certain advertising with respect to price, and to prohibit false advertising in the District of Columbia relating to alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 8087. A bill for the relief of Diana Lemaich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8088. A bill for the relief of Claudette Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8089. A bill for the relief of Silas Songsook Younn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8090. A bill for the relief of the Big Cypress Marina, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8091. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Kopec and Wladystaw Kopec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, Thou true home of our souls, whence we sprang, to whom we belong, where alone we are altogether understood, and in whose love and fellowship we may renew our strength—with all our willful rebellions confront us, we beseech Thee, with a compelling vision of Thy will in which alone is our peace, that we may be stripped of pride and made humble and penitent.

We come to Thee conscious of those lofty and eternal verities that outlast the strident confusions of any day. Give us to know that not just to bygone centuries must we turn to hear Thy voice. Unstop our ears to hear Thy imperatives above the babel of crashing systems, yea, in and through the change and perplexities of our day, where Thou art searching and sifting out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat.

So, hearing and heeding the voice divine, may the response of our compassion help to heal this sorely wounded world, so hurt by man's inhumanity to man.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 10, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 576) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 713) for the relief of Anastasia Stassinopoulos, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 857) to provide for the establishment of Cape

Cod National Seashore, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 181. An act to amend sections 3253 and 8253 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 187. An act to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation;

H.R. 1290. An act for the relief of Ernest Morris;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Sydney Gruson;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1496. An act for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Jeanine Ruth Tabacnik;

H.R. 1550. An act for the relief of Jesus Garza Lopez;

H.R. 1551. An act for the relief of Kim-Ok Yun;

H.R. 1583. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of Mr. Ernest Hay, Wamego, Kans.

H.R. 1630. An act for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Joan Josephine Smith;

H.R. 1898. An act for the relief of Isabel Brown;

H.R. 1901. An act for the relief of Georgia J. Makris;

H.R. 1960. An act to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2115. An act for the relief of Dr. Josephine L. Go and Dr. Welles P. Go;

H.R. 2136. An act for the relief of Hajime Misaka;

H.R. 3148. An act for the relief of Maddalena Haas;

H.R. 3222. An act to amend section 4(a) of the act of April 1, 1942, so as to confer jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and crossclaims in any action in which such court has initial jurisdiction;

H.R. 3227. An act to amend section 1732 (b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence;

H.R. 3393. An act for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos;

H.R. 3853. An act for the relief of Yun Soo Kahng;

H.R. 3855. An act for the relief of Dwylia McCreight and John T. McCreight, Jr.;

H.R. 4221. An act for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz;

H.R. 4300. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam;

H.R. 4553. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba;

H.R. 5182. An act for the relief of Charles P. Redick;

H.R. 7610. An act for the relief of Joe Kawakami;

H.R. 7657. An act to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, to provide a specific statutory authority for prosecution of bad check offenses;

H.R. 7676. An act for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr.;

H.R. 7739. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others;

H.R. 7809. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel;

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 472. Joint resolution providing for the apportionment to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of its share of funds authorized for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 866. An act to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals;

H.R. 2953. An act to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes;

H.R. 3385. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of electron mircroscopes and certain other apparatus imported by, or on behalf of, certain institutions;

H.R. 4206. An act for the relief of Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker;

H.R. 4349. An act to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with the United States Naval Academy graduates;

H.R. 6269. An act to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date; and

H.R. 7148. An act to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 181. An act to amend sections 3253 and 8253 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 7657. An act to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, to provide a specific statutory authority for prosecution of bad check offenses; and

H.R. 7809. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 187. An act to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation;

H.R. 1290. An act for the relief of Ernest Morris;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Sydney Gruson;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1496. An act for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Jeanine Ruth Tabacnik;

H.R. 1550. An act for the relief of Jesus Garza Lopez;

H.R. 1551. An act for the relief of Kim-Ok Yun;

H.R. 1583. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of Mr. Ernest Hay, Wamego, Kans.;

H.R. 1630. An act for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Joan Josephine Smith;

H.R. 1898. An act for the relief of Isabel Brown;

H.R. 1901. An act for the relief of Georgia J. Makris;

H.R. 1960. An act to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2115. An act for the relief of Dr. Josephine L. Go and Dr. Welles P. Go;

H.R. 2136. An act for the relief of Hajime Misaka;

H.R. 3148. An act for the relief of Maddalena Haas;

H.R. 3227. An act to amend section 1732 (b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence;

H.R. 3393. An act for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos;

H.R. 3853. An act for the relief of Yun Soo Kahng;

H.R. 3855. An act for the relief of Dwylia McCreight and John T. McCreight, Jr.;

H.R. 4221. An act for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz;

H.R. 4553. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba;

H.R. 5182. An act for the relief of Charles P. Redick;

H.R. 7610. An act for the relief of Joe Kawakami;

H.R. 7676. An act for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr.;

H.R. 7739. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others; and

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3222. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Act of April 1, 1942, so as to confer jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and cross-claims in any action in which such court has initial jurisdiction; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4300. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren D. Quenstedt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 171) making certain changes in committee assignments, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Be it further

Resolved, That the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary; and that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 171), was considered and agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT—NEW JERSEY TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Public Law 86-683, the Chair appoints the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CASE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as members of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

A letter from the Cochairmen, U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, covering the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX DIVISION, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of permissive activities relating to the manufacturing and taxation of distilled spirits, wine, beer, and tobacco products of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, November 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF POWER ACTIVITIES, U.S. SECTION, INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of power activities, U.S. section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Department of State, fiscal years 1958-60 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEWS OF LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the reviews of local housing authorities, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN RECEIVER-TRANSMITTERS UNDER CONTRACT WITH RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of AN/ARC-21 receiver-transmitters under Department of the Air Force negotiated fixed-price contract AF 33 (600)-35867, with Radio Corp. of America, Defense Electronic Products, Camden, N.J. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Alumni Club of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Puerto Rico, endorsing the democratic form of government in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two resolutions adopted by the Wyoming Federation of Republican Women in convention at Buffalo, Wyo., May 19 and 20, 1961, relating to communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF COFFEY COUNTY, KANS., FARMERS UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Coffey County Farmers Union at a recent meeting in Burlington, Kans., adopted a resolution urging approval of H.R. 6400 and S. 1643, generally known as the omnibus farm bill.

The resolution stresses the need for legislation that will assure the farmer of his fair share of the national income.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas special Federal legislation, for many years past, has given corporations, labor unions, medical, and other professional societies, protection and bargaining power; and

Whereas agriculture, a $40 billion business, is the life blood of America; and

Whereas the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961—which has been presented to Congress by the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture—if passed, would—

1. Strengthen family farming and the entire rural community;

2. Raise farm income and stabilize farm prices;

3. Adjust production in line with need for food and fiber, at home, and abroad;

4. Provide consumers with plentiful supplies at fair prices;

5. Provide producers with bargaining power, through planned commodity programs; and

6. Manage our abundance consistent with sound conservation for our future needs; and

Whereas the large vote by farmers for production controls, in the past, and the large signup for the present feed grain program is an indication that the farmers favor effective farm legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Coffey County Farmers Union, in session this 20th day of June, at Burlington, Kans., urge the passage of H.R. 6400 and S. 1643, generally known as the omnibus farm bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Congressman GARNER E. SHRIVER, Senators FRANK CARLSON and ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, and Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, and Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, and copies be sent to local papers for publication.

H. A. DRESSLER,
President, Coffey County Farmers Union, Burlington, Kans.

EDUCATIONAL TV—EDITORIAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, educational TV can be of great service to our Nation and this session of Congress should take action in getting it underway.

The last session of the Kansas Legislature enacted legislation and voted funds for this purpose. When the Federal Government votes money for this

purpose, the funds voted by the State of Kansas will be available for matching.

Recently Mr. Thad Sandstrom, general manager of Radio Station WIBW and Station WIBW–TV, discussed this in a timely editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GO ON EDUCATIONAL TV

(By Thad M. Sandstrom)

The continuing need for more and better education is apparent to educators, parents, children, scientists, businessmen, government officials—in fact almost anyone. There are vast new horizons ahead. Knowledge is the key to the survival of the free world.

We believe educational television can do much in Kansas and the Nation. The time for action on educational television in Kansas is now. Too much time has been wasted.

We believe a fundamental mistake has been made in planning for educational TV in Kansas. Those active in promoting educational TV have insisted the Legislature commit itself to a statewide system so everyone in Kansas could benefit from educational TV.

Nobody really knows what educational TV can do for Kansas. Considering the total cost of education in Kansas, the expense of operating an educational TV system would be a drop in the bucket. Through educational TV, schoolchildren would have the benefit of the best teachers in the State, and in fact, in the Nation. Educational TV will not replace the school classroom, but it can do much to make classroom work more effective.

Up to this time, various committees have studied and reported—and nothing has happened.

It appears likely Congress will soon appropriate $\$1/2$ million to each State to build transmitters with matching State funds. With matching State money, this will give Kansas $1 million to start an educational TV system. This is about enough to fully equip two transmitting plants and studios.

Channel 8 is allocated to Manhattan. Channel 11 is allocated to Lawrence. Both Kansas State at Manhattan and Kansas University at Lawrence have applied for these channels, but have no money to run them.

Over a year ago, WIBW suggested that FCC rules would permit channel 11 be transferred to Topeka and channel 8 to near Hutchinson.

This recommendation was later made in the State-financed feasibility study. Channel 8 near Hutchinson would reach Hutchinson, Wichita, Salina, Newton, and the populous areas of central Kansas. Channel 11 operating in Topeka would reach Topeka; Manhattan; Lawrence; Kansas City, Kans.; Emporia, another area of heavy population.

Someone must take the lead. Applications should go to the FCC requesting shifts in channel allocations. Transmitters at Topeka and Hutchinson would cover about 75 percent of the State's population.

Let's get going with educational TV. Let's get these two channels in operation to show what can be done.

Kansas University and Kansas State should take the lead. With the qualified radio-TV people already on the staffs at Kansas University and Kansas State, an adequate job of programing educational TV on a limited basis to get started is possible with a modest budget.

We've waited long enough on educational TV in Kansas. WIBW stands willing and able to lend technical and management assistance to Kansas University, Kansas State and others interested. Let's get Kansas off dead center on educational TV.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the National Editorial Association at its annual convention in Salt Lake City adopted a resolution in regard to postal rate increases.

The resolution states that the setting of equitable postal rates cannot be done until a proper allocation of public service costs is made to permit assessment of expenses to the various classes of mail.

This is a position that I have taken for many years and it is based on hearings before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present administration seeks to abandon the traditional postal policy which has encouraged the flow of information and news, a policy that has contributed greatly to the expansion of access to the printed word for more than a century; and

Whereas the postal rate increase legislation now before the Congress fails to follow the Postal Policy Act of 1958 which calls for establishing proper offsets for public services performed by the Postal Establishment but not properly chargeable to users of the mails; and

Whereas setting equitable postal rates cannot be done until a proper allocation of public service costs is made to permit assessment of expenses to the various classes of mail; and

Whereas the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department improperly imposes far too heavy a burden on second class mail: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That the National Editorial Association urges the Congress to insist that proper allocations for public service costs of the Post Office be made before action is taken to change the second class postal rate structure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 1070. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance (Rept. No. 527).

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 320. A bill to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State (Rept. No. 528).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 2225. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; and

S. 2226. A bill to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2227. A bill to relieve the cities of Skagway and Hoonah, Alaska, of all liability to pay the United States for certain public works projects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2228. A bill for the relief of Martha Huber Vavra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 2229. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

S. 2230. A bill to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment; and

S. 2231. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2232. A bill for the relief of Wong Gee Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2233. A bill to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park;

S. 2234. A bill to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park; and

S. 2235. A bill to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 171) relative to committee service of Senators DIRKSEN, FONG, and TOWER, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS: INCREASE OF FEES AND PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by request of the Secretary of Commerce I send to the desk two bills for appropriate reference.

The first bill provides for the increasing of fees collected by the U.S. Patent Office of the Department of Commerce in consideration of the issuance of patents and the registration of trademarks and the performance of related activities.

The second bill is to amend title 35 of the United States Code, entitled "Patents," in order to carry into effect the provisions of the convention at Paris for the protection of industrial property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958. This bill of course, as stated, is to revise the patent law to accord with the provisions of the Lisbon convention.

It is planned that when the subcommittee can do so, both of these bills will be the subject of hearings in order that all interested parties may set forth their views in regard to the several provisions contained in these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 2225. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; and

S. 2226. A bill to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958.

THREE NEW NATIONAL PARKS FOR UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to authorize the creation of three new national parks in southern Utah. They are Arches, Capitol Reef, and Cedar Breaks. Each of them is now a national monument; but all three fully deserve the recognition, standing and prestige which will come from national park designation.

These three areas contain some of the most magnificent scenery to be found anywhere in the world. While each area is unique, they are all individually spectacular and comprise in their own way veritable wonderlands of nature. Recently Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall visited Utah and stated that acre for acre southern Utah contains the "greatest concentration of scenic wonders" in the Nation. He also said that Capitol Reef and Arches National Monuments are deserving of national park status. To these two I have added Cedar Breaks, because I feel that it, too, merits such recognition.

Yet, in spite of the inspiring grandeur of these three national monuments, the number of people who visit them is relatively small. While the nearby Grand Canyon National Park received 1,187,000 visitors in 1960, only 102,500 visited Capitol Reef, 115,800 visited Cedar Breaks, and 71,600 visited Arches. Thus the people of America are being denied and are denying themselves the stirring experience of visiting these truly fantastic and awe-inspiring areas.

A principal reason for the relatively small number of visitors is, I am sure, the fact that they have not received national park designation. Their present national monument status does not carry with it in the public mind the prestige associated with national parks. Such recognition is not only deserved, but long overdue.

ARCHES NATIONAL PARK

Arches is located in the heart of the famed Red Rock country of southeastern Utah, just to the north across the Colorado River from the picturesque town of Moab.

Eighty-eight openings that are large enough to be classed as arches have been discovered within the boundaries of this national monument, hence the origin of its name. Other arches are probably hidden away in remote and rugged parts of the area. Spectacular towers, sweeping coves, shapes resembling figures of men and animals, balanced rocks, and other weird forms resulting from the combined action of running water, wind, rain, frost, and sun form a setting to which the arches themselves are a majestic culmination.

Arches National Monument was established by President Herbert Hoover on April 12, 1929. It constitutes an area of 53 square miles.

I was pleased to work with the National Park Service in accelerating the construction of a new access road to Arches. It was completed in 1958 and climbs through the standstone cliffs behind the monument's headquarters and passes through the Courthouse Towers section. Among the most famous scenic areas are the Windows section, and Devils Garden containing famous Landscape Arch, which is 291 feet long and is believed to be the longest natural-stone span in the world. Similarly Klondike Bluffs and Delicate Arch must not be missed in any visit to Arches.

CAPITOL REEF

The striking Capitol Reef wilderness area is in the heart of the famed Wayne Wonderland, a vast scenic region in south-central Utah. Appropriately its boundaries are in Wayne County. Much of this intricately eroded and bright-colored region has never been explored. The national monument was established by Presidential proclamation on August 2, 1937, and covers more than 61 square miles.

Because it resembles domed capitol buildings, the great, 20-mile-long buttressed sandstone cliff with its cap of white Navajo sandstone, was named Capitol Reef. Early geologists called such cliffs in this area reefs because of their visual resemblance to sea reefs composed of rock, or limestone skeletons of coral.

The monument includes a section of the Waterpocket Fold, a great doubling up of the earth's crust, which was caused by an unusual geological movement. The western edge of this fold—of which Capitol Reef is a part—is exposed as a great cliff or escarpment of brilliantly colored rock layers. It extends from Thousand Lake Mountain southeastward about 150 miles to the Colorado River. The fold or reef, fantastically eroded by rain and wind, is a barrier to the traveler. It can be crossed in only three places on horseback. One of these passages also allows automobiles to cross.

Just this past week, contracts have been awarded to build a new $900,000 road from Fruita across the monument paralleling the Fremont River. I was pleased to work with the Park Service on this important project. Because of its peculiar geographical isolation, made the more so by tilted sedimentary rocks, awesome cliffs and canyons and rock masses carved by the elements into weird and fanciful figures, the Fremont River drainage was the last section of Utah to be explored and settled.

Visitors should not miss Capitol Reef itself, Twin Rocks, Chimney Rock, and the spectacular Sulphur Creek Gorge. In addition there are Basketmaker petroglyphs about 1,200 years old and many other spectacular sites.

CEDAR BREAKS

The Cedar Breaks National Monument is located near the progressive city of Cedar City, Utah.

Situated high on the Markagunt Plateau in southern Utah at elevations reaching 10,700 feet, the monument contains a gigantic multicolored natural amphitheater. Within the steepwalled amphitheater, the visitor will see limestone eroded into many fantastic shapes that have been formed by the never-ending efforts of rain, wind, snow, and ice. These formations display an amazing variety of color, as constantly changing light accentuates and subdues the vivid hue of the rocks. Sweeping vistas and attractive wildflowers offer superlative scenic values.

The monument is about 4 miles long and 2½ miles wide, covering almost 10 square miles. Two-thirds of the area is composed of high cliffs and steep talus slopes of the amphitheater. Cedar Breaks is surrounded by Dixie National Forest, which provides many recreational activities for the sportsman and camper.

Early exploration of the Markagunt Plateau began in 1851, when the Mormons settled in Parowan and Cedar City, in the valley to the west. In 1852, church leaders explored the headquarters of the Sevier and Virgin Rivers, which rise on the plateau, but they made no reports concerning the cliffs that are known today as Cedar Breaks.

Both the Wheeler and Powell surveys of 1872 made extensive topographic records of the area as well as observations on the plants, animals, and geology. For more than three decades following these scientific surveys, use was made of the grazing and timber resources.

The first protection afforded this unique region was in 1905 when it was included as part of the Sevier—now Dixie—National Forest and was administered by the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The area was established as a national monument by Presidential proclamation on August 22, 1933, and was placed under the administration of the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of Interior.

Under the Mission 66 program initiated by President Eisenhower, a visitors' center has been built on the rim 1 mile from the south entrance of the monument. At my request, the Department of Interior initiated an accelerated construction of a 5-mile rim drive from Point Supreme to North View, which is a most inspiring, scenic drive.

Among the highlights of any trip to Cedar Breaks is a visit to Point Supreme, Sunset View, Chessman Ridge Overlook,

and North View. Each viewpoint presents a scene that furnishes a magnificent color panorama of this spectacular area.

SOUTHERN UTAH PARKWAY

On February 6, 1961, I introduced a bill, S. 808, to authorize construction of a Southern Utah Parkway under the administration of National Park Service and Forest Service. It would connect the national parks and monuments of southwestern Utah with the national monuments and recreation areas of southeastern Utah. Among the areas so connected would be the three national monuments that I have discussed today.

Upon introducing the bill, I invited attention to the fact that the parkway would be a national park in its own right because of the scenic areas which it would traverse. I also noted that there are no national parkways west of the Mississippi and that a portion of the $16 million which is appropriated annually for this purpose should be allocated to a parkway in southern Utah.

The Bureau of Public Roads has already surveyed at least four routes which are feasible from an engineering point of view. In addition to this, State and local groups have successfully surveyed other routes. The cost of acquisition of the land would be minimal, since nearly all of the area is federally owned, save for a few acres. Thus far, Secretary of the Interior Udall has declined to survey possible routes, but I am hopeful that he will conduct such a study in the near future.

NEEDLES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

On March 7, 1961, I introduced a bill, S. 1239, to create the Needles National Recreation Area in San Juan County, Utah. The bill covers 75,200 acres and includes Salt Creek Canyon, Horse Canyon, Chesler and Virginia Parks, Chesler Canyon, and Butler Wash. Generally, it is bounded on the west and north by the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and on the south and east by the township and section lines necessary to effectively control the drainages of Salt and Horse Canyons and Butler Wash. On the north, a quarter township is included to permit access to Lost and Salt Canyons and to control more effectively the logical entrance to the plateau upon which the main needle formations are located. Domestic water and terrain suitable for a headquarters area also require the acquisition of land in the northeast corner of the proposed tract. Within the boundaries of the area are 11 surveyed State sections. The remainder is public domain.

It is an area of spectacular sandstone formations sculptured by the forces of weathering into bizarre pinnacles, fins, and arches. Parallel faulting has resulted in an erosional pattern forming literally a maze of slitlike, sheer-walled canyons.

My bill implements a detailed report prepared by the National Park Service. Moreover, the National Park Advisory Board in September 1960 recommended that it be included within the national park system. Thus far, Secretary Udall has not given this bill his approval, but I hope he will now that he has made his recent trip down the Colorado River. In the bill, I expressly provide that multiple use shall be continued in keeping with the wishes of the people of the area. It has great potential mineral wealth, particularly oil. This activity can be carried on under suitable regulations.

RAINBOW BRIDGE NATIONAL MONUMENT

On March 2, 1961, I introduced a bill, S. 1188, to designate the present Rainbow Bridge National Monument as a national park. In doing so, I indicated that I would be prepared to have the proposed national park expanded provided it met with the agreement of the Navajo Indians and provided it did not result in an exchange of lands unfavorable to the people of San Juan County such as that involved in the Glen Canyon Dam exchange. It is likely that when the Natural Bridges National Monument is developed and made accessible it, too, should qualify for national park status. Unfortunately, it has been neglected for over 50 years. I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to budget funds for next year to correct this serious oversight and I hope, too, that he will support appropriations for road development in the old Zion National Monument area which has been similarly neglected for 24 years. Similarly, I hope that he will send up to the Senate a favorable report on my bill to create a Golden Spike National Monument in Box Elder County, Utah.

If the Secretary of Interior and Congress will give their support to all of these measures, the American people will be permitted at long last to visit these magnificent areas.

Because of the great importance of the three bills I have introduced today, I am asking the other three Members of the Utah congressional delegation to join me in sponsoring them, and ask unanimous consent that they be held on the table for cosponsorship until Thursday, July 13, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 2233. A bill to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park;

S. 2234. A bill to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park; and

S. 2235. A bill to establish Cedar Breaks National Monument as Cedar Breaks National Park.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2236) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity.

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO EMPLOY ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

The draft legislation submitted herewith proposed authority for the Department of Commerce to employ noncitizens in scientific or technical work. Authority, similar to that here sought, was granted by the Congress recently to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Congress has exempted the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have also been given authority by Congress to employ noncitizens for certain necessary purposes.

In many instances, agencies of this Department engaged in scientific and technical work of critical national importance have found that the only persons qualified and available to undertake these projects could not be hired because, as noncitizens, they were ineligible for employment by the Government.

The proposed legislation would enable the Department to make the best possible use of available scientific manpower. Any employment under the proposed legislation would, of course, continue to be subject to a prior determination that no qualified U.S. citizen is available for the particular position. The legislation provides adequate authority for investigation to determine the suitability and security status of aliens who may be employed thereunder.

The Department urges early enactment of the proposed legislation.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 7851, and ask for its appropriate reference to committee.

This is an amendment to the defense appropriation bill, the purpose of which would provide that none of the funds appropriated shall be used except, as far as practicable, all contracts must be

awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

This is the same amendment that was included as a part of the Defense Appropriation Act last year. I fully recognize this is a problem which should be dealt with legislatively. I have, on repeated occasions, sponsored bills before the appropriate legislative committee which would make it mandatory that, under all circumstances except where the national interest was involved, all agencies should award their contracts to the lowest responsible bidder.

However, having been unable to get action on that bill, I am taking steps to offer that language as a proviso to the Defense Appropriation Act, which will at least give some protection so far as spending money under this particular bill is involved.

I do not have to remind the Senate of the fact that the Comptroller General has called our attention repeatedly to situations wherein an unnecessarily large percentage of the contracts entered into by the Defense Department are presently being awarded on a negotiated basis. As a result the taxpayers are paying hundreds of millions of dollars annually for services which would not be necessary if the procurement division of the Defense Department followed some good, sound business practices requiring competitive bids and then awarding the contracts to the lowest responsible bidder.

I will not at this time go into a list of cases showing such unnecessary tests which have been brought to light. They have been mentioned many times in the Comptroller's reports and on the floor of the Senate.

I am merely asking that the amendment be referred to the committee, and I hope it will be accepted by the committee. If it is not adopted by the committee, I shall offer it again when the bill is before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Agriculture today, that my name may be added as a cosponsor. I had made such request the other day when the bill was introduced, but I understand that my request reached the officials too late to go to the printer. But since there will be a committee print of the bill with the amendments today, I ask now that my name may be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 139. An act for the relief of Krste Angeloff;

S. 442. An act for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris);

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic monument purposes;

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 576. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis;

S. 1720. An act to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world; and

S. 1931. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address by Senator JAVITS delivered before the American Management Association Conference in New York City, relating to legislation in the field of world trade.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Public statement adopted by the Executive Committee of Citizens' Committee for International Development, announced at the White House, Washington, D.C., on July 10, 1961; also article entitled "Transcript of President's Appeal for Aid Program," published in the New York Times of July 11, 1961.

EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 467, House bill 5490, to provide more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5490) to provide more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 456), is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (c)(2)(A) by striking out in the last sentence thereof the words "eight years" and substituting the words "six years" in lieu thereof;

(2) by amending subsection (c)(2)(B) to read as follows:

"(B) Any person who after attaining the age of eighteen years and six months, but prior to attaining the age of twenty-six years and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction, enlists or accepts appointment in an organized unit of the National Guard shall be deferred from training and service under this Act so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit. No person deferred under the provisions of this clause shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces by reason of subsection (h) of this section after the twenty-eighth anniversary of the date of his birth or the sixth anniversary of the date of his enlistment or appointment in such unit, whichever occurs later. No such person who has completed six years of satisfactory service as a member of an organized unit of the National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than three consecutive months shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress.";

(3) by amending subsection (c)(2)(D) by striking out in the last sentence thereof the words "eight years" and substituting the words "six years" in lieu thereof;

(4) by amending subsection (c)(2)(E) to read as follows:

"(E) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the President, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may provide that any person enlisted in the Ready Reserve of any reserve component of the Armed Forces pursuant to authority conferred by this paragraph or under section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, or any member of the National Guard deferred from training and service by clause (A) of this paragraph, or any person enlisted or appointed in the National Guard after the effective date of this amended clause and deferred from training and service by clause (B) of this paragraph, who fails to serve satisfactorily as a member of such Ready Reserve or National Guard or the Ready Reserve of another reserve component of which he becomes a member may be selected for training and service and inducted into the armed force of which such reserve component is a part, prior to the selection and induction of other persons liable therefor.";

(5) by amending clause (C) in the first sentence of subsection (d)(1) to read as follows: "(C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission,";

(6) by amending the fifth and sixth sentences of subsection (d)(1) to read as follows: "If, at the time of, or subsequent to, such appointment, the armed force in which such person is commissioned does not require his service on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by him in compliance with clause (B) of the first sentence of this paragraph, such person shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force in the grade in which he was

commissioned for a period of active duty for training of not less than three months or more than six months (not including duty performed under section 270(a) of title 10, United States Code), as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be necessary to qualify such person for a mobilization assignment. Upon being commissioned and assigned to a Reserve component, such person shall be required to serve therein, or in a Reserve component of any other armed force in which he is later appointed, for the remainder of his service obligation."; and

(7) by striking out in the seventh and eighth sentences of subsection (d)(1) "in such unit" wherever it appears therein.

SEC. 2. Section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1013), is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (b)(3) the words "eighteen years and six months" and substituting the words "twenty-six years" in lieu thereof; and

(2) by striking out in the first sentence of subsection (c) thereof the words "eight years" and substituting the words "six years" in lieu thereof;

(3) by amending the last sentence of subsection (c) thereof to read as follows: "Each such person (1) shall be deferred from training and service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily, as determined under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, (2) shall by reason of that deferment remain liable for induction for training and service under the provisions of section 4(a) of such Act until the twenty-eighth anniversary of the date of his birth or until the sixth anniversary of the date of his enlistment under this section, whichever anniversary occurs later, and (3) upon the completion of six years of such satisfactory service pursuant to such enlistment shall be exempt from further liability for induction for training and service under such Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after August 9, 1955."

SEC. 3. Section 270 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Any person who becomes a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States after the enactment of this subsection and who fails in any year to perform satisfactorily the training duty prescribed by or under law for members of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, as determined by the Secretary concerned, may, upon the request of the Governor of the State or territory, Puerto Rico, or the Canal Zone, or the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, whichever is concerned, be ordered, without his consent, to perform additional active duty for training for not more than forty-five days. A member ordered to active duty under this subsection shall be ordered to duty as a Reserve of the Army or as a Reserve of the Air Force, as the case may be."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 651(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each person who becomes a member of an armed force before his twenty-sixth birthday shall serve in the armed forces for a total of six years. Any person covered by this subsection may be sooner discharged because of personal hardship under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or, if he is a member of the Coast Guard while it is not operating as a service in the Navy, by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any part of such service that is not active duty or is active duty for training shall be performed in a reserve component."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective with respect to all persons who became members of the armed forces prior to the date of enactment of this Act as well as to all persons who become members after the date of enactment of this Act, any enlistment or written agreement entered into prior to such date to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 5. Section 3261 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the designation "(b)" in subsection (a) and inserting the designation "(c)" in place thereof; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection "(c)" and inserting the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, a person who enlists or reenlists in the Army National Guard, or whose term of enlistment or reenlistment in the Army National Guard is extended, shall be concurrently enlisted or reenlisted, or his term of enlistment or reenlistment shall be concurrently extended, as the case may be, as a Reserve of the Army for service in the Army National Guard of the United States."

SEC. 6. Section 8261 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the designation "(b)" in subsection (a) and inserting the designation "(c)" in place thereof; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection "(c)" and inserting the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, a person who enlists or reenlists in the Air National Guard, or whose term of enlistment or reenlistment in the Air National Guard is extended, shall be concurrently enlisted or reenlisted, or his term of enlistment or reenlistment shall be concurrently extended, as the case may be, as a Reserve of the Air Force for service in the Air National Guard of the United States."

SEC. 7. Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 302 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 302. Enlistments, reenlistments, and extensions

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, original enlistments in the National Guard may be accepted for—

"(1) any specified term, not less than three years, for persons who have not served in an armed force; or

"(2) any specified term, not less than one year, for persons who have served in any armed force.

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, reenlistment in the National Guard may be accepted for any specified period, or, if the person last served in one of the highest five enlisted grades, for an unspecified period.

"(c) Enlistments or reenlistments in the National Guard may be extended—

"(1) under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, at the request of the member, for any period not less than six months; or

"(2) by proclamation of the President, if Congress declares an emergency, until six months after termination of that emergency."

(2) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following item:

"302. Enlistments."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"302. Enlistments, reenlistments, and extensions."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by sections 5, 6, and 7 of this Act shall not affect any enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment entered into or made before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 29(a) of the Act of August 10, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 30r), is amended by striking out the words "fiscal year" wherever they appear therein and substituting the words "calendar year" in lieu thereof.

(b) Except with respect to substitute postal employees, the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective as of January 1, 1961, and with respect to substitute postal employees such amendments shall become effective as of January 1, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the committee report on House bill 5490.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 498) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would make omnibus amendments to the laws relating to the 6-month training program and participation in the Reserve components.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 contemplated a 6-month training program only for persons under the age of 18½. Subsequent to the enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, Selective Service regulations that defer a person participating satisfactorily in the Reserve have made possible the successful operation of a 6-month training program for persons over the age of 18½. There are now some statutory gaps, however, that this bill is intended to close. The principal features of the bill are—

1. To reduce from 8 to 6 years the obligated service of persons who enlist in the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½. Those who enlist in this program before reaching the age of 18½ now have an 8-year obligation, while those who enlist in it after reaching the age of 18½ have a 6-year obligation.

2. To provide a statutory deferment for those who enlist in the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½. Those persons now have a deferment only by regulation.

3. To provide authority for the priority induction of persons who enlist in the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½ and who fail to participate satisfactorily. Existing authority for such priority induction is limited to those who enlist before reaching the age of 18½.

4. To provide authority for requiring an additional 45 days of training for members of the National Guard who fail to participate satisfactorily in Reserve training. Existing authority for 45 days of additional active duty for training as an enforcement measure is limited to members of the Reserve.

5. To provide flexibility in the terms of enlistment in the National Guard. The law now provides that original enlistments in the guard shall be for 3 years and reenlistments for periods of 1 or 3 years. The bill proposes to provide that enlistments in the National Guard may be accepted for any specified term not less than 3 years for persons with no prior service and for any specified term not less than 1 year for persons who have had prior service. The requirement that original enlistments must be for 3 years has acted as a deterrent to enlistments of persons who have a remaining Reserve obligation of less than 3 years.

6. To modify a requirement that ROTC graduates who are not needed on extended active duty must perform active duty for training for 6 months. The Department of Defense indicates that the necessary training can be given in less than 6 months and

desires to substitute a variable period of 3 to 6 months in the discretion of the Secretary concerned but with the requirement that the initial period of active duty for training be of sufficient length to qualify the officer for mobilization assignment.

7. To revert to a calendar year basis for computing the 15 days of annual leave with pay to which reservists who are Federal employees are entitled for the purpose of performing active duty for training. Until Public Law 86–559 was enacted, the 15 days of leave with pay were credited on a calendar year basis. The change to a fiscal year basis caused difficulties for a reservist who performed training duty in August of 1960, for example, and whose unit was ordered to training duty again in June of 1961.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 added to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 a section authorizing an 8-year enlistment in the Reserve of persons who had not reached the age of 18½. Persons enlisted under this program are required to perform an initial period of active duty for training of not less than 3 months or more than 6 months (in practice it is 6 months) and to participate satisfactorily in the Reserve after such active duty for training for the remainder of their enlistment, unless excused under regulations by the Secretary of Defense. Persons who enlist in this program and who fail to participate satisfactorily as a member of the Ready Reserve may be ordered to additional active duty for training for 45 days or they may be subjected to priority induction into the armed force of which their Reserve component is a part.

In the addition to the 6-month training program that is being operated under the authority of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, two other somewhat similar programs are being conducted.

The first of these additional programs is for persons who enlist in the Reserve after reaching the age of 18½. When section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act originally was enacted, this authority was needed to provide draft exemption for those persons who enlisted in the program and continued to participate satisfactorily in it. At that time there was no general authority for deferment or exemption from induction merely because of membership in a Reserve component. Since section 262 was enacted, Selective Service regulations have had the effect of opening the 6-month training program to persons over the age of 18½. These regulations, which were promulgated under Executive Order 10809, provided deferment for any registrant who is serving satisfactorily as a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces and they protect such a person from induction after completion of 6 years of satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve. These regulations, in combination with the authority to enlist persons into the Reserve components that is contained in sections 510 and 511 of title 10, United States Code, made possible the successful operation of a 6-month training program for persons over the age of 18½. The persons who enlist in this program incur a 6-year obligation, in contrast to the 8-year obligation that is incurred by persons enlisting in the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½. Moreover, since the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 did not contemplate a 6-month training program for persons over the age of 18½, there is no authority for the priority induction of those persons enlisting in the Reserve after reaching the age of 18½, who fail to participate satisfactorily in Ready Reserve training.

The second program involving 6 months of active duty for training, other than that authorized by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, is for members of the National Guard. Section 6(c)(2)(A) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act authorizes a deferment for persons under the age of 18½ who enlist in organized units of the National Guard. This provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act authorizes deferment for persons in this program so long as they continue to participate satisfactorily and, after reaching the age of 28, these persons are exempt from induction. Persons who have completed 8 years of satisfactory service as a member of a National Guard unit and who have performed active duty for training of not less than 3 months during such period are exempt from induction, except during a war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the effective date of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. In practice, the performance of an initial period of active duty for training of 6 months is prescribed as a condition of enlistment in this program. The Selective Service regulations promulgated under Executive Order 10809 that provided deferment for a registrant serving satisfactorily as a member of a Reserve component also permitted the National Guard to operate a 6-month training program for persons over the age of 18½. There are no statutory provisions for the priority induction of those persons who entered the National Guard or a Reserve component after reaching the age of 18½ and who do not satisfactorily discharge their obligation to participate in training. Similarly, there is no authority to require 45 days of additional active duty for training by those members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who failed to participate satisfactorily in Ready Reserve training. There is a further disparity in that persons enlisting in the National Guard after reaching the age of 18½ have a total period of obligated service of only 6 years, in contrast so the 8 years that are required before a person enlisting in the National Guard prior to reaching the age of 18½ acquires a draft exemption.

EXPLANATION

Deferments and exemptions for Reserves

As discussed earlier, the law does not provide a deferment or exemption for persons enlisting in a Reserve component after reaching the age of 18½. Nonetheless, persons enlisting in a Reserve component after reaching the age of 18½ have their induction postponed or delayed as long as they continue to participate satisfactorily. Persons without previous service who enlist in the Ready Reserve after reaching the age of 18½ incur a 6-year obligation, while those who enlist before reaching the age of 18½ incur an 8-year obligation. To eliminate the incongruity that results from imposing a longer obligation on a person who voluntarily enlists before he reaches the age of liability for induction, this bill would reduce the obligation of persons enlisting in the Reserve before reaching the age of 18½ from 8 to 6 years.

Priority induction

Existing law authorizes the priority induction of those persons who enlist in the Ready Reserve before reaching the age of 18½ and who fail to participate satisfactorily as a member of such Ready Reserve. Those persons who enter the National Guard or a Reserve component after reaching the age of 18½ are not subject to the priority induction provisions. Since this method of enforcing participation in National Guard training is unavailable, the States have the unsatisfactory alternatives of punishing the person under State codes, or of discharging him and causing him automatically to become a member of another Reserve component. The bill, then, would authorize the priority induction of those persons over the age of 18½ who become members of the Ready Reserve of any armed force after the effective date of the bill and who fail to serve satisfactorily.

Forty-five days of additional duty for training

Section 270 of title 10, United States Code, provides authority to require persons enlisted or appointed in the Ready Reserve after August 9, 1955, to perform 45 days of additional active duty for training if they fail to participate satisfactorily in Ready Reserve training. This authority does not apply to members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States. As a result, National Guard authorities have inadequate means of dealing with those who fail to perform the required training. State courts-martial or discharge and reporting of the person to the Selective Service System for routine induction are the only means of dealing with such persons who have enlisted after reaching the age of 18½. Priority induction can be used as a last resort for those who have acquired a deferment because of having enlisted before reaching the age of 18½.

The bill consequently would provide authority to order persons who become members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States after its effective date to 45 days of active duty for training upon the request of State or other appropriate authority if these persons fail to participate satisfactorily in National Guard training.

National Guard enlistments

Section 302, title 32, United States Code, provides that original enlistments in the National Guard shall be for a period of 3 years, and reenlistments for periods of 1 or 3 years. The disadvantages of these provisions are their lack of flexibility with respect to length of enlistments, the administrative burden which is imposed upon the National Guard in effecting enlistments and discharges in order to comply with the law, and the deterrent effect which present requirements have upon enlistments.

In the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, persons may enlist for periods from 2 to 6 years. Normal enlistments in the Regular Air Force are 4 to 6 years. In the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve, periods of enlistment are prescribed by the Secretary concerned. This greater flexibility allows persons to enter a component for a period more nearly fitting the person's plans and avoids the necessity for effecting discharges and reenlistments, the administrative burden of which has led many States to prohibit 1-year reenlistments.

The requirement that original enlistments in the National Guard be for a period of 3 years has acted as a deterrent to enlistments in the cases of persons who have a remaining Ready Reserve service obligation of less than 3 years.

For example, a person leaving the Active Army or Air Force with an obligation to participate in the Ready Reserve for a period of only 2 years would be reluctant to enlist in a National Guard unit for 3 years. Other persons who have received basic training in the Army Reserve or Air Force Reserve and who may desire to enlist in the National Guard may be discouraged from doing so if the period of enlistment is longer than the remaining period of their required Ready Reserve participation. The National Guard has need for such trained personnel, especially those who have served 2 or more years in the Active Army or Air Force, and every effort is being made to encourage such persons to enlist in the National Guard. It is desirable, therefore, to remove any obstacles, statutory or otherwise, which would tend to discourage such enlistments.

The bill would therefore amend section 302 of title 32 to permit enlistment of nonprior

servicemen for 3 years or more, and prior servicemen to enlist for 1 year or more. This will provide a flexible enlistment program, and persons will be enabled to enlist in the National Guard and as Reserves for their total remaining service obligation, of whatever duration. Persons in one of the highest five enlisted grades will be allowed, under regulations of the Secretaries, to enlist for an indefinite period on a career basis, paralleling that for "first three graders" of the active establishment in sections 3256 and 8256 of title 10.

In addition, in lieu of the discharge and reenlistment, with the consequent paperwork now required in the National Guard, a person may request extension of his current enlistment for any period not less than 6 months, which, if authorized, can be accomplished quickly and simply with a minimum of administrative work. The present provisions authorizing the involuntary extension of enlistments in case of a national emergency are continued.

Active duty for training for ROTC graduates

Section 6(d)(1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides that ROTC graduates commissioned in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces whose services are not required on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by them shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force for a period of 6 months. However, it is uneconomical to require a 6-month active duty for training period for these officers if it is possible to indoctrinate and train them in less time. It is desirable, therefore, to have as much flexibility as possible in prescribing such duty tours for these officers.

The proposed legislation substitutes a variable period of 3 to 6 months in the discretion of the Secretary of the service concerned, for the directory 6-month provision of present law, with the proviso that the initial period of active duty for training be of sufficient duration to qualify the officer for mobilization assignment.

It is desirable also to have a certain amount of flexibility with reference to the Reserve obligation of these officers. The present law states that such an officer "shall be assigned to an appropriate Reserve unit until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission."

The bill would permit the officer to complete his service obligation in a Reserve component in any armed force. It also would reduce the requirement for 8 years of service in a Reserve component to 6 years in order to achieve consistency with the reduced service obligation of persons enlisting in the 6-month training program.

Leave for reservists who are Federal employees

Until 1960 Federal employees who were members of the Reserve were entitled to leave with pay for not more than 15 days in any calendar year for the purposes of performing training duty. Substitute postal employees were entitled to leave of absence based on the number of hours worked in the calendar year before that in which they were ordered to training duty. Public Law 86-559 changed the basis for computing this leave from the calendar year to the fiscal year to coincide with the availability of annual training duty.

The change has been to the disadvantage of certain reservists who performed training duty in July or August of 1960 and whose units were ordered to duty again in June of 1961.

The bill proposes to revert to the calendar-year basis for crediting this leave. In accordance with a recommendation from the Comptroller General, the committee suggests that the change be made retroactive to January 1, 1961, for employees other than substitute postal employees and prospective to January 1, 1962, for substitute postal employees. The difference in effective dates is not to discriminate against substitute postal employees. Instead, it recognizes that the leave of these employees is computed on the basis of their service in the preceding year. The 1960 change had created quite a problem in resolving the rights of the substitute postal employees that was solved by a General Accounting Office decision that, in effect, postponed the full operation of such change for substitute postal employees until the fiscal year 1962. The committee expects the Comptroller to make an appropriate adjustment for substitute postal employees during the transition period similar to that authorized by the Comptroller at the time of the change from a calendar- to a fiscal-year basis.

LENGTH OF OBLIGATED SERVICE

As referred to the committee the bill proposed to extend the service obligation of persons enlisting in the Reserve after reaching the age of 18½ from 6 to 8 years. It obviously is incongruous for a person who enlists before he is draft vulnerable to have a longer obligation than a person who enlists after reaching the age at which he is subject to induction. The committee, however, decided to make the service obligation of persons enlisting in the 6-month training program uniform at the 6-year level instead of at 8 years. This change would be retroactive in effect and would extend to those persons who have enlisted at a time when an 8-year obligation was required. A corresponding reduction from 8 to 6 years has been made in the obligation of ROTC graduates whose services are not required on extended active duty and who perform 6 months of active duty for training instead.

The committee emphasizes that this reduced obligation should not be construed as an indication that international conditions permit any relaxation in our preparedness efforts or in our attempts to achieve an effective Reserve. There is full awareness of the importance in creating a trained Reserve composed largely of persons who have not previously fought a war or served on active duty for long periods. At the same time the committee strongly believes that the responsibilities for defending our country should be shared fairly and that a reduction in the service obligation should cause an increase in the number of eligible persons who have been given some training and who would be available in the event of an emergency.

The 8-year obligation was imposed on persons in the 6-month training program by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This report has mentioned elsewhere that when the 1955 act was considered there was no thought of a 6-month training program being offered to persons over the age of 18½. When such a program was initiated an inequity resulted in that persons under the age of 18½ had an 8-year obligation, while persons who enlisted in the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½ had a 6-year obligation. The Army Reserve and the Army National Guard, the largest users of the 6-month training program, adjusted this inequity by varying the period for which enlistees were required to participate actively in the Reserve. Persons enlisting in the Army Reserve and the National Guard before reaching the age of 18½ were required to perform 6 months of active duty for training, 3 years of active participation in the Ready Reserve, and 4½ years of participation in the Standby Reserve. Persons enlisting in the Reserve and the National Guard after reaching the age of 18½ are required to perform 6 months of active duty for training and 5½ years of active participation in the Ready Reserve. Hence, although a person entering the program after reaching the age of 18½ has a total obligation of only 6 years, these persons are required to participate actively for 5½ years, or 2½ years longer than a person who entered the program before he was draft vulnerable. In the Marine Corps, persons entering the 6-month training program are required to perform 6 months of active duty for training, followed by 4½ years of active participation in the Ready Reserve, irrespective of whether the person enlisted before or after reaching the age of 18½. The remaining part of the total obligation is spent in the Ready Reserve, but there is no requirement that the person participate actively after 5 years. Thus, the Ready Reserve designation is more a measure of vulnerability for recall to active duty than a measure of the extent of the person's participation in Reserve training.

Persons who are members of the Standby Reserve can be recalled to active duty only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress and then only if the Director of Selective Service has determined that the member is available for active duty. A person who is a member of the Ready Reserve may be recalled to active duty involuntarily in a national emergency proclaimed by the President alone after August 9, 1955. For members of the Army Reserve and the National Guard the effect of the committee action is to release those persons who enlisted in the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ from 2 years of membership in the Standby Reserve. Since Standby reservists can be recalled to active duty only in a congressional declaration of war or national emergency and only after the Director of Selective Service has determined that the member is available for active duty, it is apparent that the change will not substantially affect the availability of reservists in these components. In the Marine Corps Reserve there will be a loss of some persons who now are liable for recall as members of the Ready Reserve, although they are not actively participating in training. This Ready Reserve strength reduction for the Marine Corps would be about 1,500 in 1962, 5,900 in 1963, and 7,200 in 1964, with declining annual loss thereafter. To maintain the same Marine Corps Ready Reserve strength from fiscal year 1968 forward, it will be necessary to recruit and train additional personnel in the 6-month training program starting in fiscal year 1963. The committee considers that the additional costs of recruiting and training such personnel are justified, not only in the interest of causing the obligation for military service to be more extensively shared, but also in the interest of having more persons with some military training available in the manpower pool. In other words, it might be more convenient and less expensive to have a 10- or 12-year obligation than a 6- or 8-year one, but against convenience and expense must be balanced the objective of an equitable distribution of the burden of military service.

One other consideration needs to be mentioned. Under the committee bill the obligation of all persons in the Armed Forces will be 6 years. Without compensatory arrangements in the form of the length of active participation required, this uniform requirement might be unfair, since a person who has performed 2 years or more of extended active duty obviously has contributed more than a person who has performed only 6 months of active duty for training. The committee believes that this problem can be solved fairly by adjusting the period of time that a person is required to participate actively in the Reserve in accordance with the length of active duty or active duty for training performed. For example, a 2-year inductee should be required to participate actively in the Reserve for a shorter period than a person who enlists in the 6-month training program before he is draft vulnerable, and a person who enlists

in the 6-month training program before he is draft vulnerable should be required to participate actively for a shorter period than a person who enlists in the 6-month training program after he is draft vulnerable. The Secretary of Defense has adequate authority under existing law to establish the required periods of active participation in the Reserve on a graduated basis.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The only parts of the bill having a financial impact are the provisions (1) authorizing 45 days of active duty for training for members of the National Guard who fail to participate satisfactorily, (2) reducing the length of active duty for training by ROTC graduates, and (3) reducing from 8 to 6 years the service obligation of persons entering the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½.

The Department of Defense estimates that the enforcement of active participation by members of the National Guard through ordering those who fail to participate satisfactorily to 45 days of active duty for training would cost a maximum of $325,000 in the first year, with a diminishing annual cost thereafter that will level off at about $160,000.

Annual savings of about $1.8 million are estimated to result from the reduction in the length of the active duty for training tours by ROTC graduates.

It is difficult to estimate the fiscal effects of the reduction in the obligated service of persons who enlist in the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½. Except for this change, the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard personnel affected would have served an additional 2 years as members of the Standby Reserve. Presumably no replacements for these persons need to be recruited and trained. The Marine Corps personnel affected would otherwise have served 2 additional years as members of the Ready Reserve, with a vulnerability for recall to active duty, but not in a training status. To estimate the cost of training additional persons to maintain the numbers of Marine Corps reservists now projected for fiscal year 1969 and following years it is necessary to make many assumptions and guesses, including the strength of the Marine Corps Ready Reserve in 1969 and the percentage of Marine Corps 6-month trainees who enlist before reaching the age of 18½. A preliminary staff estimate is that an additional 4,000 6-month enlistees in 1963 and an additional 8,000 in 1964 and following years would enable the Marine Corps to maintain the Ready Reserve strength projected for 1969 and following years under existing law. The cost of giving 6 months of active duty for training to one enlistee is slightly more than $1,000.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report is a letter from the then Secretary of the Army indicating that the bill as it was referred to the committee was a part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense recommended that the obligated service of persons entering the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½ be increased from 6 to 8 years. For reasons explained earlier in this report the committee has reduced the obligation of those enlisting in the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ from 8 to 6 years in order to make the length of service obligation uniform. Except for this change, the Department of Defense approves the objectives of the bill.

Also printed below and made a part of this report is a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States dated May 29, 1961, recommending the amendment to section 9 that has been adopted by the committee.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed a draft of legislation to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1961, and the Bureau of the Budget advised on December 23, 1960, that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is (1) to provide for the deferment of a member of the Ready Reserve who, before being ordered to report for induction, agrees or has agreed to perform 3 to 6 months active duty for training, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve; (2) to provide for a draft exemption for a member if he serves satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve for the period that he is required by law to remain in the Ready Reserve, or who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than 3 consecutive months; (3) to authorize the priority induction of certain members in the Ready Reserve who are subject to induction and who fail to serve satisfactorily as such members; (4) to authorize the Army or the Air Force, at the request of the State or other appropriate authority, to order certain members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States who fail to participate satisfactorily in National Guard training to additional active duty for training for 45 days; (5) to provide for flexibility with respect to the term of enlistments in the National Guard; and (6) to provide for flexibility with respect to the active duty for training obligation and the Reserve obligation of ROTC graduates.

(1) and (2) Deferments and exemptions for Reserves: Existing provisions of law provide deferments for a member of a Reserve component who enlists under section 262, Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as added by section 2(i), Reserve Forces Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 600) (8-year enlistment, 3 to 6 months' active duty for training program), so long as he participates satisfactorily in Ready Reserve training. This program is restricted to individuals enlisting prior to attaining age 18½. In the National Guard, an individual enlisting or accepting an appointment in an organized unit prior to reaching age 18½ is granted, under section 6(c)(2)(A), Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 610), as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 456(c)(2)(A)), a statutory deferment from induction so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of his unit. Both of the cited provisions also provide that any member who serves on active duty for training for at least 3 months and who completes 8 years of satisfactory service is exempt from induction, except in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress. The law, however, does not provide any deferment or exemption for individuals enlisting in a Reserve component after they reach age 18½. Under current Selective Service directives, the induction of any individual is postponed or delayed so long as he continues to participate satisfactorily in a Reserve component. In accord with this policy, the Army has a Reserve component procurement program for individuals aged 18½ to 25, inclusive, which requires 6 months of active duty for training and participation thereafter until the sixth anniversary of the date of enlistment. This program has proven to be an extremely popular program with young men and hence provides a valuable flow of basically trained individuals into the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. Non-prior-service personnel who enlist in a unit of the Ready Reserve of the Army between the ages of 17 and 18½ years incur an 8-year obligation. However, non-prior-service personnel who so enlist after they attain the age of 18½ incur a 6-year obligation. The Department believes that all non-prior-service personnel who enlist in a Reserve component should incur the same obligation. The proposed legislation equalizes the two age groups by providing that the 18½- to 26-age group also incur an 8-year obligation. This will provide more equitable treatment with respect to the inductee who performs 2 years of active duty and incurs a 6-year obligation.

The proposed legislation will give flexibility to the existing program by authorizing a statutory deferment for any member in the Ready Reserve who, before being ordered to report for induction, agrees or has agreed to perform 3 to 6 months active duty for training, as the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of the Ready Reserve, and will require that this initial period of active duty for training will be of sufficient duration to qualify the individuals concerned as basically trained for duties assigned. If the member serves satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve for the period that he is required by law to remain in the Ready Reserve, or has during such service performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than 3 consecutive months, he will thereafter be exempt from induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, except in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

(3) Priority induction for Reserves: Section 6(c)(2)(E) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, supra, authorizes the priority induction of those individuals enlisted or appointed in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces pursuant to authority contained in section 6c of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, or enlisted under section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, supra (8-year enlistment of 17- to 18½-year-olds who agree to perform 6 months' active duty for training), when such individuals fail to serve satisfactorily as a member of the Ready Reserve. The individuals affected by this provision of law are, therefore, restricted to those who enter the National Guard or a Reserve component prior to reaching age 18½; those who become members of such organization after attaining age 18½ are not subject to the priority induction provisions. In the Reserve components (other than the Army or Air National Guard of the United States), any person, 18½ or older, who is enlisted or appointed after August 9, 1955, and who fails to participate satisfactorily, may be ordered to additional active duty for training for 45 days. However, there is no means of enforcing participation in National Guard training. The States, therefore, are faced with the distasteful alternatives of punishing the individual under State codes or discharging the individual and allowing him to become automatically a member of one of the other Reserve components, where efforts must be made to induce participation before the 45-day enforcement provision may be applied. While such persons may be reported to Selective Service for failure to participate satisfactorily, there is no assurance that they will be inducted in view of limited quotas which now prevail in many areas. The absence of effective means to provide prompt corrective action for failure to participate on the part of in-

dividuals entering a Reserve component after reaching age 18½ may result in encouraging others to regard their participation obligations lightly, thus creating serious problems of administration and preventing the attainment of well-trained, well-disciplined units.

The proposed legislation would provide authority for the priority induction of any person, otherwise subject to induction, who is enlisted or appointed in the Ready Reserve of an armed force after the effective date of this legislation and who fails to serve satisfactorily as such a member.

(4) Forty-five days' additional active duty for training: Section 270, title 10, United States Code, which provides authority to order individuals enlisted or appointed after August 9, 1955, to 45 days' additional active duty for training when they fail to participate satisfactorily in Ready Reserve training does not apply to members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States. The disadvantages stated in paragraph (3), above, are also applicable to the lack of authority to apply the 45-day provision to the National Guardsmen. There is an added consideration, however, in favor of applying the 45-day enforcement provision to the National Guard. In many cases, unit commanders of the National Guard might prefer to have an individual perform 45 days' active duty for training and return to his unit, rather than lose him altogether through induction.

The proposed legislation would provide authority to order persons who become members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States after its effective date and who fail to participate satisfactorily in National Guard training to 45 days' active duty for training at the request of State or other appropriate authorities.

(5) National Guard enlistments: Section 302, title 32, United States Code, provides that original enlistments in the National Guard shall be for a period of 3 years, and reenlistments for periods of 1 or 3 years. The disadvantages of these provisions are their lack of flexibility with respect to length of enlistments, the administrative burden which is imposed upon the National Guard in effecting enlistments and discharges in order to comply with the law, and the deterrent effect which present requirements have upon enlistments. In the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, individuals may enlist for periods from 2 to 6 years. Normal enlistments in the Regular Air Force are 4 to 6 years. In the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve, periods of enlistment are prescribed by the Secretary concerned. This greater flexibility allows individuals to enter a component for a period more nearly fitting the individual's plans and avoids the necessity for effecting discharges and reenlistments, the administrative burden of which has led many States to prohibit 1-year reenlistments. The requirement that original enlistments in the National Guard be for a period of 3 years has acted as a deterrent to enlistments in the cases of individuals who have a remaining Ready Reserve service obligation of less than 3 years. For example, an individual leaving the Active Army or Air Force with an obligation to participate in the Ready Reserve for a period of only 2 years would be reluctant to enlist in a National Guard unit for 3 years. Other persons who have received basic training in the Army Reserve or Air Force Reserve, and who may desire to enlist in the National Guard, may be discouraged from doing so if the period of enlistment is longer than the remaining period of their required Ready Reserve participation. The National Guard has need for such trained personnel, especially those who have served 2 or more years in the Active Army or Air Force, and every effort is being made to encourage such individuals to enlist in the National Guard. It is desirable, therefore, to remove any obstacles, statutory, or otherwise, which would tend to discourage such enlistments.

The proposed legislation would amend section 302, supra, to provide that enlistments in the National Guard may be accepted for any specified term, not less than 3 years, of persons with no prior service, or for any specified term, not less than 1 year, of persons who have had prior service in any armed force. It would also provide that reenlistments could be accepted for any specified period or, if the person last served in one of the highest five grades, for an unspecified period. Extensions of enlistments could be accepted for any period of not less than 6 months. Persons enlisting or reenlisting in the National Guard would be concurrently enlisted or reenlisted as Reserves of the Army or Air Force, as appropriate. The proposed amendments discussed in this paragraph are the same amendments recommended in the Department of Defense report to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on H.R. 6296, 85th Congress.

(6) Active duty for training for ROTC graduates: Section 6(d)(1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, supra, provides that ROTC graduates commissioned in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces whose services are not required on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by them shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force for a period of 6 months. However, it is uneconomical to require a 6-month active duty for training period for these officers if it is possible to indoctrinate and train them in less time. It is desirable, therefore, to have as much flexibility as possible in prescribing such duty tours for these officers. The proposed legislation substitutes a variable period of 3 to 6 months, in the discretion of the Secretary of the service concerned, for the directory 6-month provision of present law, with the proviso that the initial period of active duty for training be of sufficient duration to qualify the officer for mobilization assignment.

It is desirable also to have a certain amount of flexibility with reference to the Reserve obligation of these officers. The present law states that such an officer "shall be assigned to an appropriate Reserve unit until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission * * *." The proposed legislation retains the requirement of 8 years of service in a Reserve component, but restates this requirement to permit the officer to complete the service obligation in a Reserve component of any armed force.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

If this legislation is enacted, of the seven items which make up this legislative proposal, only that provision which would authorize members of the National Guard who fail to participate satisfactorily to be ordered to 45 days' active duty for training would result in increased costs to the Government. It is estimated that, for a 5-year period following enactment, this item would cost the Departments of the Army and Air Force as follows:

	Army	Air Force
1st year	$300,000	$25,000
2d year	225,000	17,000
3d year	170,000	10,000
4th year	150,000	10,000
5th year	150,000	10,000

The above amounts have not been included in any estimate for appropriations submitted through budget channels by the Department of Defense.

It is also estimated that an annual savings of about $1.8 million would result from the reduction in the length of the active duty for training tours of ROTC graduates participating in the 6 months, 8-year program.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 5490) was read the third time, and passed.

SIZE AND WEIGHT OF TRUCKS ON MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAYS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday Representative MCCORMACK, the majority leader of the House, had the House pass House Joint Resolution 472. That joint resolution would permit, until March 15, 1962, trucks using Massachusetts highways to exceed the weight and size requirements in connection with the receipt of funds from the Federal Government.

I have talked with my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and with the majority leader, and with the minority leader. I hope the joint resolution will be promptly passed by the Senate, so that Massachusetts may receive these highway funds until March 15 of next year, even though the size and weight of trucks on its highways are too great.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not press for action on this measure. One of the great achievements of the National Highway Act of 1956 was the accomplishment of national standards of weights and measurements of trucks. If Congress were to start permitting, State by State, the States to receive benefits——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, let me say the joint resolution would permit this in Massachusetts only until March 15, 1962. Apparently the act became law without knowledge in Massachusetts of the limitations under it.

If this joint resolution is not enacted, Massachusetts will have to call a special session of its legislature, in order to have its law changed. In order to avoid that expense, and because of the question of time, and in order to permit Massachusetts to share in the benefits under the Highway Act, Representative MCCORMACK had the House pass, on yesterday, this joint resolution; and the House passed it unanimously.

I have taken up this matter with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and with the majority leader and his assistant. I have not been able to get in touch with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I believe the procedure authorized by the joint resolution will be helpful.

I agree entirely with what the Senator from Tennessee says. But if the joint resolution is not enacted, it will be

necessary for a special session of the Massachusetts Legislature to be called for the sole purpose of permitting Massachusetts to enact such a measure before the next regular session of the legislature, in January. This joint resolution will apply only until March 15, 1962.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee that I would not ask for an extension of the time fixed in the measure. Massachusetts will come in conformity with the legislation next year. It could do it this year by calling a special session.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will not press the matter at this time. As the Senator knows, I was coauthor of the 1956 act. I would regret very much seeing an exception made for a State. It might well be that a special session of the Legislature of Massachusetts would be far less expensive than the destruction of its highways by overweight vehicles, and far, far less expensive than if such action as is proposed becomes a precedent and the precedent allows the law to be violated State by State.

I hope the Senate will defer consideration of the measure until I can have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will withdraw my request at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], who is also vitally interested in this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say I joined the Senator in my proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. This measure is something we feel is most urgent and necessary, but I defer now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I will immediately set about studying the proposal. I hope that it can be worked out.

REENLISTMENT BONUSES UNDER THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 468, House bill 4324.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4324) to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement relative to the reasons why this legislation is necessary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would make uniform certain language in sections 207 and 208 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 that prescribes the period within which reenlistments must occur for a member to be entitled to reenlistment bonuses. It is intended to eliminate the confusion and problems that have resulted from the use of the term "90 days" at one place and the term "three months" at another place in the law.

EXPLANATION

Until July 16, 1954, enlisted members of the military services who had continuous service, that is those who reenlisted within 3 months after the date of their last discharge, were entitled to either an enlistment allowance based upon years of service in the enlistment from which they were last discharged or a reenlistment bonus based upon the number of years for which they reenlisted. The act of July 16, 1954, added to the Career Compensation Act of 1949 a new section 208 that prescribes an alternative and sometimes more liberal system of reenlistment bonuses for persons reenlisting after July 15, 1954, and within 90 days after the date of their last discharge.

After enactment of the act of July 16, 1954, some discharged enlisted men failed to realize that even if they reenlisted within 3 months after their last discharge the elapsed time from date of the last discharge to the date of reenlistment might be either 91 or 92 days if one or more 31-day months were included in the interim break in service. As a result of the unintended difference between "90 days" and "three months," overpayments of reenlistment bonuses were made by disbursing officers with a resulting checkage of the difference between the reenlistment bonus prescribed by section 207 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (reenlistment within 3 months) and the amount erroneously credited under section 208 of that act (which requires reenlistment within 90 days.) This bill proposes to make the period within which reenlistments must be entered into under both systems uniform at 3 months. It also will extend relief to those persons who have erroneously been paid higher reenlistment bonuses as a result of the technical difference between "90 days" and "three months."

COST

The retroactive costs resulting from enactment of this bill are estimated to be nominal, and the Department of Defense indicates that these costs can be absorbed within current appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I just arrived on the floor. As a member of the calendar committee, this measure has not in any way been brought to my attention. Have these bills been cleared with the minority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; they were cleared. There were three measures we thought we could bring up yesterday, but, for reasons beyond our control, we did not do so. They have all been cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4324) was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time and passed.

MEDAL OF HONOR PENSIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 469, House bill 845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 845) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) subsection (b) of section 560 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out "sixty-five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty years"; and (2) by striking out ", and who was honorably discharged from service by muster out, resignation, or otherwise".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 560 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", and shall indicate whether or not the applicant desires to receive the special pension provided by section 562 of this title".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 561 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 561. Certificate

"(a) The Secretary concerned shall determine whether or not each applicant is entitled to have his name entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor Roll. If the official award of the Medal of Honor to the applicant, or the official notice to him thereof, shows that the Medal of Honor was awarded to the applicant for an act described in section 560 of this title, such award or notice shall be sufficient to entitle the applicant to have his name entered on such roll without further investigation; otherwise all official correspondence, orders, reports, recommendations, requests, and other evidence on file in any public office or department shall be considered.

"(b) Each person whose name is entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor Roll shall be furnished a certificate of service and of the act of heroism, gallantry, bravery, or intrepidity for which the Medal of Honor was awarded, of enrollment on such roll, and, if he has indicated his desire to receive the special pension provided by section 562 of this title, of his right to such special pension.

"(c) The Secretary concerned shall deliver to the Administrator a certified copy of each certificate issued by him under subsection (b) in which the right of the person named in the certificate to the special pension provided by section 562 of this title is set forth. Such copy shall authorize the Administrator to pay such special pension to the person named in the certificate."

(b) The analysis of chapter 15 of such title is amended by striking out

"561. Certificate entitling holder to pension."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"561. Certificate."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Medal of Honor roll" the following: ", and a copy of whose certificate has been delivered to him under subsection (c) of section 561 of this title,"; and

(2) by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the amendments made by subsection (b) of the first section and by section 2 shall not apply with respect to any application under sec-

tion 560 of title 38, United States Code, made before such first day by any person who fulfilled the qualifications prescribed by subsection (b) of such section at the time such application was made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement of the purpose of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill, H.R. 845, is to liberalize the requirements for entry on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Congressional Medal of Honor Roll and to increase the rate of the special monthly pension from $10 to $100 which may be payable to persons on the roll.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives would eliminate the existing law eligibility requirements that the individual must be 65 years of age and honorably discharged from the armed services, and would increase the amount of the special pension from $10 to $100 monthly. The bill as reported by your committee amends the House-passed bill in two particulars: one, it would prescribe an eligibility requirement of at least age 50 as compared with the requirement of existing law that the individual shall have attained age 65; two, as to those future applicants for entry on the Congressional Medal of Honor Roll, it would limit the proposed $100 rate of special pension to the individuals who specifically indicate a desire to receive such special pension. Persons already receiving the current $10 special monthly pension would not have to indicate such desire but would automatically be paid the new $100 rate from the effective date of the new law. Likewise, no such indication would be required of those whose applications for entry on the honor roll and special pension were made before, but were pending on, such effective date.

The committee believes that the bill, as amended, is meritorious. It permits a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor to have his name placed on the Medal of Honor Roll at age 50 and allows him to make the election to receive the $100 monthly pension at that age or at any future time he may so desire. Thus, it affords added recognition to a most worthy and honored group through the Medal of Honor Roll and, in addition, permits those so interested an opportunity to obtain a special monthly payment of $100.

It is not known, of course, how many of the group would choose to apply for the monthly benefit. It is estimated that 168 cases could benefit under the bill at a cost of less than $202,000 the first year. There is a potential group under age 50, totaling 128, that may become entitled upon attaining age 50, which may increase the cost in future years. The 296 accounted for is based on latest information furnished to the Veterans' Administration by the Defense Department.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1961.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letters of March 8 and 14, 1961, requesting the views of this office with respect to H.R. 845, S. 1224 and S. 1310, identical bills, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes.

You are advised that there would be no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

DON'T LET THEM RUIN OUR NATIONAL SHRINES

Senator YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], is not only an outstanding Senator of the United States but is also a writer of note. The need for preserving our national shrines is clearly pointed out by the distinguished Senator in an article which was published in the June 1961 edition of Coronet magazine. The article is entitled "Don't Let Them Ruin Our National Shrines."

The visible history of our progress as a nation is preserved in monuments and historic areas across the United States. These shrines should continue to stand as a link with the past and a guide to the future. They inspire our youth to emulation; they give our older people a pride and reverence for the past that readies them for further sacrifices to preserve this heritage. Our national parks rest the body, calm the spirit, and temper the soul for a better life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T LET THEM RUIN OUR NATIONAL SHRINES—WE MUST MAKE A STAND NOW AGAINST THOSE WHO—IN THE NAME OF "PROGRESS"—WOULD SHATTER THE PRICELESS HISTORICAL IMAGE OF OUR LAND

(By Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, as told to Keith Elliott)

In A.D. 460 the Romans decreed that anyone destroying an ancient building or shrine would be whipped and would have both his hands chopped off. The magistrate who granted a license permitting such destruction would be fined 50 gold pounds—about $46,000. I do not advocate such stern measures. But Americans today could take a lesson in historical awareness from the old Romans. A callous disregard of our cultural values is robbing future generations of an irreplaceable American resource—their tangible past.

"If America forgets where she came from," wrote Carl Sandburg, "then will begin the rot and dissolution."

Americans, many of them, are forgetting. George Washington's Morristown, N.J., headquarters is threatened by a proposed freeway. In New Mexico, pueblos dating to prehistoric times have been bulldozed for highways. A syndicate once sought to obliterate the hallowed Alamo in Texas—to make room for a hotel.

"Progress" is taking an appalling toll of our Nation's wonders. A study by the National Trust for Historic Preservation shows that at least 25 percent of the finest historic and architectural shrines in the United States have been leveled since 1941.

A recent survey reveals that New York City, Richmond, and St. Louis have lost one-third of their ancient structures worth saving in the past decade. Many of these were vitally linked to our Nation's past.

John Ruskin said of architecture:

"We may live without her and worship without her, but we cannot remember without her." Yet the structures of which our memories are made are dwindling alarmingly.

Belle Grove, a magnificent plantation house in Louisiana, was neglected for years, finally burned down in 1952. The picturesque ironfront buildings of St. Louis were ripped down by the hundreds in 1939, to be replaced by a Jefferson National Expansion Memorial which has not yet been completed. Castle Stevens at Hoboken, N.J., a landmark for over a century, was recently razed so a 13-story building could take its place. A lighthouse at Buffalo, N.Y. beacon to sailors for 126 years, has been abandoned and may be destroyed.

Built in 1904, the Larkin Building at Buffalo had been called "the most influential building in modern architecture." More than any other in the United States, possibly, this Frank Lloyd Wright structure was an architectural breakthrough. Yet it was ripped down mercilessly in 1950 after the city sold the property to a trucking firm. The site's use now: a parking lot for trucks.

The problem in the United States is not only one of preserving our architectural heritage but of preserving it intact. The Brooklyn Bridge, for instance, so long an inspiration to poets, lovers, and songmakers, is now cluttered with structural additions, utility lines, debris. Greenwich Village's sylvan Washington Square is threatened by a proposed highway interchange which city planning expert Lewis Mumford has called "an almost classic example of bad planning."

"The concrete cloverleaf," that critic has said, "is becoming our national flower." And it well may be—if we let it.

Yet as a 41,000-mile network of interstate highways slashes—usefully but sometimes indiscriminately—across the face of our land, there is a growing concern with protecting our historical and natural treasures.

More than 300 American communities now boast conservation groups dedicated to sparing shrines, parks and plazas from needless encroachment of shopping centers, superhighways, skyscrapers, parking lots, even jails. Their efforts have been heartening.

In San Antonio, Tex., for example, the Conservation Society carried on a people-to-people campaign against a proposed expressway route that would scar peaceful Brackenridge Park and other tourist attractions. Voters were convinced. Overwhelmingly, they voted down a $9 million bond issued to finance the project. However, in January 1961, developers poured more than $50,000 into an unprecedented second bond election which carried. Conservationists are now fighting the reversal in Texas courts.

Ten years before, the same group saved a charming, tree-dotted downtown plaza from becoming an underground parking lot. "We can station 10 women at every tree," promised fiery President Wanda Ford. "You'll have to chop us down before you can tackle the trees." Developers gave up the project.

American women have fortunately long taken an active interest in historical conservation. It was stubborn little Ann Pamela Cunningham, of South Carolina, who pioneered the U.S. heritage saving movement in 1859. Learning that Mount Vernon, George Washington's home, was an abandoned shambles, she organized the Mount Vernon Ladies Association to restore it. Result: last year more than 1,200,000 visitors wandered within the resurrected walls and

grounds, emerging with new appreciation for their Nation's past.

Miss Cunningham's inspiration has sparked the preservation of America's heritage. Since her battle, more than 2,000 historic house museums have come into existence. Such preservations as Thomas Jefferson's home in Virginia, Shelburne Village in Vermont, Little Norway in Wisconsin, and Fort Bridger in Wyoming provide a graphic insight into what has made America great.

There is abundant hope for more preservation of American memorabilia in the future if we open our hearts to the past. Thousands of Americans showed concern, for instance, for Boston's Old North Church, Paul Revere's signal tower, after a hurricane nearly destroyed it in 1954. Contributions poured in from every State and the historic shrine was rebuilt.

The public reacted similarly when New York's ancient Carnegie Hall was threatened by demolition in 1959. Led by violinist Isaac Stern, a citizens' committee won the cooperation of Mayor Robert Wagner in saving it. The city purchased the building for $5 million. Stern's committee raised funds to renovate the interior. Now the acoustically perfect musician's mecca will live on as a nonprofit institution—headed, fittingly enough, by Isaac Stern.

If cities can save our shrines, so can our courts. In a historic decision last year, Judge Donald S. McKinlay of Chicago ruled that an owner can be denied permission to wreck his own building—when "public esthetic interest" is involved. The decision prevented destruction of the 68-year-old Garrick Theater, a landmark in Chicago's downtown loop.

Many relics of our past might have been allowed to crumble if someone hadn't suggested a contemporary use for them. In Hannibal, Mo., for example, the stately residence of Mark Twain's childhood sweetheart, Laura Hawkins, has been restored as the Becky Thatcher Book Shop & Cafe. At Waterford, Va., an 18th-century jail is now a tourist reception center. A Quaker meeting house built in 1699 serves as a children's community center in Newport, R.I.

Caring for the past, an association in Philadelphia found a permanent berth for the flagship, *Olympia*, birthplace of the rallying cry, "You may fire when ready, Gridley." Through statewide donations the battleship *Texas* is now docked for good near Houston, 50 miles from the sea. In upper New York State, De Witt Clinton's "great ditch," the Erie Canal, is now being restored. It may soon accommodate mule-drawn barges—loaded with tourists—once again.

In Colorado and Utah we almost lost 200,000 acres of magnificent wilderness and prehistoric remains to a huge upper Colorado River storage project. Fortunately, a bill was introduced in the Senate's last regular session to preserve the area as the Dinosaur National Park.

Yet many places where history holds hands with nature are sad victims of America's growing pains. Take Gettysburg, Pa., for instance. Not long ago Congressman JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania, admitted forlornly: "The second battle of Gettysburg, the battle to save the historic b..ttlefield from commercial encroachment, is on the way to being lost."

Already a motel and ice cream stand sit smugly on land over which Confederate Gen. George Edward Pickett led his famous charge. A miniature golf course nestles near the headquarters of Gen. George Gordon Meade, the Union commander. A bowling alley now squats where Gen. James Longstreet's Texans battled.

Commercialism threatens other battlegrounds of the Civil War. In Maryland, Antietam, scene of that war's bloodiest 1-day engagement (23,000 killed and wounded), is one. Others: Fort Donelson and Lookout Mountain in Tennessee, Vicksburg in Mississippi, and Manassas, Va., site of the Battle of Bull Run.

But our national shrines are more than buildings and battlefields. "Our purple mountain majesties" and our rockbound coasts, to say nothing of our beautiful beaches, are as much a part of America's heritage as anything we have built or fought over. Thus, I have sponsored a bill to preserve for public recreation a portion of the remaining few miles of unspoiled shoreline left in this country.

Of our 3,700 miles of shoreline, only 265 miles have so far been marked as public preserve—and only a fraction is suitable for seashore recreation. The largest stretch of undeveloped beach frontage in the United States is Padre Island, in the Gulf of Mexico near Corpus Christi, Tex. Padre must be spared the fate of other waterfront wonderlands which are littered by honky-tonks, jerry-built cabins, shabby bait stands.

The Department of the Interior has called for 88 miles of 118-mile Padre Island to be set aside as a national seashore area. My bill would give the status of a national seashore recreation area, like Cape Hatteras off North Carolina, to the peaceful beaches and dunes of Padre Island. Congress, alarmed over our vanishing vistas, is considering other measures to save them.

One bill would establish 10 shoreline parks like Padre Island over the Nation. Three other bills would authorize three national seashore areas: Padre, Cape Cod, Mass., and Point Reyes in California. The wilderness bill would earmark millions of acres in various parts of the United States as "areas where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man."

Saving our shrines is good business. Luring just 25 tourists a day to a town, says the U.S. Department of Commerce, is equal in income to establishing an industry with a $100,000 payroll.

In Richmond, Va., Providence, R.I., Newburyport, Mass., and Washington, D.C., business people have organized to buy properties of historical interest, restore them and lease them to suitable tenants. Traffic flow is dramatically increased by visitors who yearn for yesteryear.

More than 36 American cities have put historic areas under control, such as the Old Charleston District in South Carolina. The Vieux Carre in New Orleans, Boston's Beacon Hill, Old Georgetown in Washington, Gratz Park at Lexington, Ky., and the Moravian section of Bethlehem, Pa.

Yet in Dallas, Tex., tree-shaded Turtle Creek Drive is being widened against the protests of thousands who signed petitions saying they preferred the view. And urban sprawl is preempting some of the loveliest remaining vistas of San Francisco's Golden Gate.

"The preservation of open space is the most important single problem that we face today in the physical development of communities," says Hugh R. Pomeroy, commissioner of planning of Westchester County, N.Y. Yet our cities' spaces are becoming increasingly crowded, while the wide-open spaces of America continue to vanish in the paths of bulldozers.

Now is the time for Americans to take stock of their irreplaceable spiritual resources—and take steps to save what remains of historical and cultural importance. A part of our national character and strength will be forever lost if we bury our past in our plans and projects for the future.

While there is still time, let's preserve America's heritage.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Madam President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio for his generous remarks when he placed in the RECORD an article from Coronet magazine. I make particular reference to the paragraph dealing with Padre Island. I hope that the national seashore recreation area will be created by this session of Congress.

WATER POLLUTION—A NATIONAL HAZARD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, having just recently returned from a short visit in the Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—where they have a superabundance of fresh, clear water, but apparently drink very little of it, it occurs to me that I should speak briefly on the subject of the contamination of water in the United States by man's activities. This is a problem as old as mankind itself, and here in America it is becoming a more serious one all the time.

In the process of settling this great continent, building farms, cities, and our great industries, we Americans have defiled our water resources on a scale greater than the world has ever seen.

Unless brought to a halt, the continuing pollution of a large part of our indispensable present and future water supply will create increasingly serious problems for every American. These problems go to the heart of our national well-being, affecting our public health, economic growth, enjoyment of living, and the balance of nature.

Every year Americans see the necessity for and approve the spending of billions of dollars for defense, additional billions are spent for soap, cosmetics, detergents, and other devices to obtain personal cleanliness. Yet, during the last administration, our President not only vetoed a modest water pollution control bill, but actually proposed drastic reductions in the annual appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. President, it is time that we begin seriously to do something about the one element which is indispensable to all Americans every day of their lives—our water supply.

We may close our eyes to the menace of sewage in our drinking water, but the American people cannot close their mouths.

Pollution of our water courses has increased sixfold during the past 60 years. It continues to increase more rapidly than preventive efforts. Our industries now discharge twice the waste substance into our rivers and streams as do all the Nation's cities and towns.

It is a fact that the dumping of industrial and other wastes into our water supply has turned it into a national health hazard. Some of our rivers and streams are nothing more than open sewers.

With population increasing rapidly, the need for pure water both for human consumption and for productive purposes looms more and more as one of our major problems. By 1980 our fresh water needs will double.

Mr. President, this is no longer a local problem. The complex pattern of waterflow in our country does not re-

spect State lines. It is unrealistic to try to control this problem in the narrow framework of what from nature's point of view are artificial State boundaries. The problem is so vital and so nationwide in its importance that it can only be coped with by the joint efforts of Federal, State, and local governments. The conference report on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 which shortly will be before us is an excellent start toward making this possible.

Waste has so polluted our water that treatment plants simply cannot keep pace with the increased loads—4,136 new sewage treatment plants are urgently required for 23 million people in communities now threatened with a dangerous sewage problem. Another thousand require major additions and enlargement of existing facilities to provide a minimum measure of safety for 19 million people.

The American people no longer can trust the water that comes out of their faucets, the water they and their children drink, the water in which they bathe and wash their clothes.

Mr. President, every time an American housewife turns on the water faucet, she is committing an act of faith.

I have received a great deal of mail protesting the increasing pollution of our rivers and streams and demanding action far beyond that provided under present programs. It is a subject which always arises when I speak to constituents in Ohio.

Incidentally, it is estimated that this legislation would immediately spur the construction of 400 sewage treatment plants in areas of substantial unemployment, many of them in my home State of Ohio.

Americans are fearful that pollution soon will completely overwhelm the capacity of our sewage treatment plants. They are fearful, too, that the recreational value of our water resources will be destroyed.

Mr. President, I do not know of a bill that has won greater popular support than this measure to control the pollution that is fouling the water that we rely on so heavily in our everyday life.

It is making our rivers and streams unfit for swimming and boating, for waterfowl and fish, and for all manner of recreational purposes at a time when these facilities are more and more demanded and needed by our citizens.

Mr. President, over $48 million of taxpayers' money has been spent in over 30 foreign countries for water and sewage disposal improvements.

For example, in 1955 we spent $4 million in Pakistan and $2 million in India. In 1957 we spent $2 million in Panama. In 1958 Burma received almost $3 million. All for water and sewage disposal improvements in foreign countries.

Under the bill reported by the conference committee, Ohio communities will receive $2,737,000 in 1962, $3,079,000 in 1963, and $3,421,000 each year through 1967.

Certainly the citizens of Ohio are entitled to the same consideration as the people of Pakistan, India, Panama, and Burma. The same is true for citizens in all the States of the Union, as this comparison is valid for them all.

In the 4 years the original Federal Water Pollution Control Act has been in operation, it has resulted in projects which will clean up more than 14,000 miles of America's streams and rivers.

But the little that has been done has only served to show that a great deal more is needed.

There is no question that our water resources can be improved for all uses. The growing threat that pollution poses to the health of our people can be controlled and defeated.

Our water supply is constant, but our use of water grows each year. If pollution continues unchecked, the Nation will soon face a calamity of major proportions.

Mr. President, the issue which will be before us in the conference report is a simple one. We benefit by water that is clean, and we are penalized by that which is dirty. The penalty for our neglect of this vital national resource—if we chose to do so—will be paid for by generations of Americans to come.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on April 6 the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I introduced a bill, S. 1508, which would give the Government greater authority in controlling propaganda sent to the United States from other countries.

It will be recalled that on March 17 President Kennedy ordered discontinuance of the program of intercepting Communist propaganda from abroad. This program, instituted by President Truman and carried on by President Eisenhower, provided a substantial though incomplete deterrent to the dissemination within the United States of Communist propaganda from abroad. Our bill would restore this program, and would close technical loopholes which hindered its operation while it was in effect.

Today there is evidence that President Kennedy's ill-advised order of March 17 is having its inevitable result. According to Irving Fishman, deputy collector of customs at the port of New York, Communist propaganda is now flooding into the country. Because of the President's action, customs agents can no longer intercept Communist mailings, but their obligation to determine whether there is any duty due enables them to keep track of the volume. Since March 17 there has been a great increase in propaganda coming in, particularly from the Soviet Union and Cuba.

As an indication of the incredible volume of this propaganda, Mr. Fishman advised the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that during 1960 the number of political propaganda packages received in the United States from the Soviet Union was an unprecedented 14,170,529. And from Cuba we received, during a period of only 2 months, 162,087 packages of Communist magazines and 11,700 packages of newspapers, all by air freight—during a period of only 2 months.

And bear in mind that these figures reflect the volume before the President opened the floodgates on March 17. What the volume is today, we do not yet know.

The way in which the Communists are using their new freedom to propagandize Americans and European refugees in this country is illustrated in a technique now being used on persons of Hungarian origin.

In an effort to get homesick Hungarians to return to their homeland, where they may be exploited for propaganda purposes, Communist Hungary is sending Hungarian refugees in America an attractive tabloid, Hungary News, painting a glowing picture of life behind the Iron Curtain, and inviting them to return.

This material has been sent in large quantity since last March, because, as observed in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 5, 1961:

> The dike was opened then by a Presidential order that the Post Office Department stop impounding Communist propaganda carried in the mail from abroad.

One article tells the Hungarians that they have until December 31 to apply to the closest Hungarian legation for a special Hungarian passport. Another urged them to return even for a brief visit. What is not mentioned is that under Hungarian law, such persons have dual citizenship and when they set foot on Hungarian soil, they become subject to the perils of Hungarian law.

And what is being done to block such schemes as this? Nothing. The Post Office says its hands are tied. Likewise, the State and Justice Departments seem to be doing nothing.

This bill cannot be construed as censorship. It affects only material being disseminated by agents of foreign governments. It requires such agents to register, and requires that propaganda be plainly marked to indicate that it is being distributed by a foreign government or the agent of a foreign government. The bill also makes administrative changes in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

Mr. President, we must not blind ourselves to the effect which Communist propaganda might have within the United States if left completely free of any restrictions. I hope the Judiciary Committee will give early consideration to S. 1508, so that the inflow of Communist propaganda from abroad can be checked.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

FAITH IN AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this time of national peril, too few Americans seem willing and able to take time to recall the ideals for which America stands and, when necessary, fights. So much attention is devoted to the grim details of the cold war struggle that we tend to lose sight of the ideals we intend to defend.

It is particularly important that the young people of this Nation be reminded of these values and principles. All too

often, the impression gets abroad that our youths have nothing to fight for, whereas the young people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are the true and only fighters for freedom. No effort must be spared to put the lie to this debilitating and crippling impression.

With this need so clearly before us, it was especially heartening to me to read the report of a commencement message delivered recently by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein at Benjamin Franklin High School in Rochester, N.Y. Rabbi Bernstein's outstanding record in the field of brotherhood and as a spiritual guide for literally millions of Americans make him eminently qualified to speak on this theme. His presentation was realistic but inspiring, and it is not often that these qualities are combined in an address on the meaning of America.

The eloquence and importance of Rabbi Bernstein's remarks were recognized by the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle in a significant editorial of June 25, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST KEEP OUR FAITH STRONG IN REAL MEANING OF AMERICA

It is not the fashion among many American intellectuals to dwell on "the need for faith" in the meaning of America, or to emphasize that there is much in which we should take pride. So it was particularly helpful and heartening that Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein should have made these things the core of his message last night to the Benjamin Franklin High School graduating class.

"We need not and must not accept the judgment of our enemies upon us," this eminent spiritual leader told the youngsters. This cannot be repeated too often today when the mobs of anti-American foreign students flash so often into the news and it is so much the custom to berate America.

No apology is necessary for our prosperity which American wealth and benevolence have made possible, the Rabbi said. He agreed with the judgment of famous writers and philosophers that "spiritual values can reside and do reside in a higher standard of life, in healthy babies being born into the world and surviving, and in the leisure which properly used can make for the good life."

Rabbi Bernstein also devoted much of his address to what is wrong with America, to the need for elimination of discrimination and injustice, to the evidence that too much of our youth is soft, physically, and morally. "Mistake me not," he said. "I am encouraging no pollyannaish glossing over of our mistakes nor of the injustices and evils that still prevail in American life."

Nevertheless, while Americans still strive to make their Nation match the ideals in which it was created, they must know that we are doing better all the time. There must be the faith that in this country those ideals are the root of our success. For with such faith in ideals, a nation is not destroyed even though it may be conquered, said the Rabbi.

America is not the real estate that was taken from the Indians, nor the tall buildings, fast cars and giant highways. America is essentially the promise that all men shall indeed be equal under law, and that individual rights will be respected, and, above all, that this is only possible when men are free and self-governing.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a column written by one of the newspaper profession's most distinguished writers, Marquis W. Childs, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 9, 1961. The column is devoted to the subject embraced in its title, "Fulbright, a Quiet Critic, Making Influence Felt as Shaper of Foreign Policy."

The burden of the column is to point up the great and statesmanlike contribution the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas is making in his role as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and as a Member of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT, A QUIET CRITIC, MAKING INFLUENCE FELT AS SHAPER OF FOREIGN POLICY—CHAIRMAN OF SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE WANTS U.S. TO LIMIT COMMITMENTS TO ITS CAPACITY—WARNED KENNEDY OF CONSEQUENCES OF CUBAN VENTURE AND NOW HAS SENT HIM MEMO ON BERLIN

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has assumed a role of the first importance in shaping U.S. foreign policy. It is as a critic, detached but also thoroughly informed, that FULBRIGHT is performing a service, the significance of which is just beginning to be evident.

Although the circumstances are entirely different, what FULBRIGHT is undertaking has some resemblance to the great service of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. At the end of World War II, Vandenberg renounced his former isolationism and successfully brought the Republican Party, and with it a large and stubborn segment of opinion, around to the need for America to play an active and constructive role in world leadership. He was one of the chief instruments in the success of the Marshall plan which saved Western Europe from communism.

With, as he believes, American commitments today extended far beyond any practical limits, FULBRIGHT is arguing the need to scale down these commitments to reasonable proportions. What he is saying, both in public and private, is that these commitments are in many instances self-defeating. Because they are impossible of fulfillment over the long pull, they are contributing to a growing mood of frustration in the country, and that frustration threatens to lead either to war or to a new form of isolationism which Vandenberg believed he had put an end to.

The memorandum on Cuba, dated March 29, which Senator FULBRIGHT sent to President Kennedy 2 weeks before the Cuban fiasco, is a model of reasoned statesmanship. It was a clear and unmistakable warning that any invasion attempt, whether failure or success, would shatter the treaty system on which the relationships of the hemisphere are based and thereby have disastrous political and economic consequences. Success of an invasion attempt, with the need for the United States to sustain a military dictatorship in Cuba over a long period, might be worse than failure, the memorandum pointed out.

In a Senate speech last week, FULBRIGHT said:

"It may be that the time has come to reappraise some of our basic assumptions. Throughout much of this century, many Americans assumed—wrongly—that the transgressions and affronts to world order committed by aggressive forces were none of our business. With the collapse of that assumption, a good many of us have swung in the other direction and to the opposite conclusion that we can—and should—impose our design for living upon the uncertain but aspirant societies of the world. This assumption is also illogical. However admirable our design may be, it cannot be imposed."

This is what FULBRIGHT is saying in a challenging and forthright fashion as Government witnesses come up to present the case for foreign aid in closed committee sessions: Is this essential to the Nation's security? Does it contribute to that security or is it a delusion bound to end in bitterness and perhaps disaster?

He is asking these questions particularly about South Korea. He pointed out the other day that, after the expenditure of $4,500 million in the past 10 years, since the end of the Korean war, the result is a sterile military dictatorship with great continuing unemployment and a swollen population sustained by American relief. The aid total does not include the cost of maintaining 65,000 American troops in Korea at a cost averaging $7,000 a year for each man.

There are things that can be done with military force in being, FULBRIGHT is saying, but it is important to understand the limits of that force. Where force cannot impose the American design or even compel any meaningful allegiance to a military alliance, it is wiser to accept the neutral solution. He would apply this concept to much of southeast Asia.

The other day FULBRIGHT sent a memorandum on Berlin to the President. He will not discuss its contents since the situation is delicate and the President's decision so difficult.

But it could well be an important factor in whatever decision is taken. On one side is the Acheson plan providing for the callup of at least two National Guard divisions to be sent to Europe to buttress American forces in Germany. This would be part of a mobilization to impress Moscow with America's determination to stand firm.

On the other side, some in the executive branch are convinced the United States must come up with constructive alternative plans for Berlin to protect the status of the city while possibly opening the way to negotiation.

FULBRIGHT'S friends sometimes urge him to take his case more dramatically and dynamically to the Senate floor, but that is not his style. He is trying through quiet persuasion, the voice of reason, to help bring about one of those profound changes such, as in the time of Vandenberg, are necessary to adjust the Nation's policy to the Nation's capacity.

In last week's speech, FULBRIGHT quoted from the famous guerrilla warfare treatise of Mao Tse-tung who directed the vast operation in China that ended with a Communist triumph and Mao as the dictator over 650 million people. Mao said:

"Guerrillas are like fish and the people are the water in which the fish swim. If the temperature of the water is right, the fish multiply and flourish."

In colonial Indochina in 1945, FULBRIGHT went on, the temperature was right. The French spent $7 billion in 8 years trying

to defeat the Vietminh guerrilla army. This effort cost the lives of 100,000 French and Vietnamese. The French at one stage committed a force of 500,000 men. But France, FULBRIGHT told the Senate, bore the heavy burden of its colonial record and its unconcern with political and social reform. France lost.

Somewhat the same situation prevailed in Laos, in FULBRIGHT's view. The United States made a grave error in trying to convert that southeast Asian country into an anti-Communist bastion, according to FULBRIGHT.

As for neighboring South Vietnam, which has been reported to be gravely threatened by Communist guerrillas, FULBRIGHT believes that the proper course for the United States is to continue to sustain and support the Vietnamese Army in its struggle to overcome the tough guerrilla foe. But at the same time, he believes, every effort should be made to help the Vietnamese people to achieve greater economic progress and more political independence. He calls the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem a "qualified success," rebuking critics who have accepted abusive propaganda about Diem.

If the United States cannot compel the newly aspiring nations to accept the American design for living, neither, in the Fulbright view, can Soviet Russia impose its design. He points to the difficulties Moscow is currently having with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, despite the fact that the Soviets have advanced large sums for construction of the Aswan Dam and have given other aid.

After President Kennedy's election last November there were reports that FULBRIGHT was being considered seriously for the post of Secretary of State. Later reports were to the effect that, because of FULBRIGHT's southern background and because he had signed the southern manifesto on integration, the President-elect had turned to Dean Rusk. Those opposed to his selection are said to have argued that, in the light of his past views, he would be embarrassed in dealing with the new African nations.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, FULBRIGHT almost daily meets with ambassadors and distinguished foreign visitors. They are anxious to get from him the congressional view of foreign policy.

While the committee had fallen into a somewhat somnolent state under the previous chairman, 91-year-old Senator Theodore Francis Green, it has always had one of the ablest professional staffs in the Capital. FULBRIGHT has given this staff, under the direction of Carl Marcy, added responsibility.

Next year FULBRIGHT will be up for reelection to his fourth term in the Senate. It has been thought that his principal opponent would be Gov. Orval Faubus, eager to extend his activities to the national field. Exploiting the race issue to the fullest, Faubus, it was believed, would give FULBRIGHT a hard time.

But recently the Governor, who precipitated the integration showdown at Little Rock, had a severe setback when a State bond issue he had gone all out for was defeated. Moreover, there is said to be some reason to believe that Arkansas voters may have come to feel that the Faubus segregation tactics harmed the State and slowed down its industrial growth.

Equally important in any appraisal of the election situation is the stature of FULBRIGHT as a U.S. spokesman on foreign policy. He ranks as one of the major figures on the international scene and increasingly his influence is being felt not only in Washington, but in London, Paris, Tokyo, and the other capitals.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FEDERAL SYSTEM OF ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES FOR THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN SYSTEM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have received from one of our outstanding mayors of Wyoming, Mr. R. Everette Michel—"Butch" Michel, as we call him—the mayor of one of our most progressive cities, Torrington, resolutions from two groups in my State, which he asks me to include in the RECORD, in regard to the proposal for transmission lines which are being considered in relation to the upper Colorado River development program.

One of the resolutions comes from the Wyoming Association of Municipalities. At the State meeting gathered at Rawlins, Wyo., on the 23d day of June, they petitioned the Congress to give most serious consideration to the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal for a Federal transmission system.

The second resolution comes from the Goshen County Cooperative Beet Growers Association, petition in the same cause to the same end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON HYDROELECTRIC POWERPLANTS

Whereas certain hydroelectric powerplants have been constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation in the Colorado River Basin system, from which electric power will be made available to a five-State area including the State of Wyoming; and

Whereas by existing laws of the United States such electric power is to be first sold to preference users, including municipalities and rural electrical associations; and

Whereas the previous Secretary of the Interior in the Republican administration, and the present Secretary of Interior in the Democratic administration have both issued their decision providing for the construction of an all-Federal system of transmission lines from said hydroelectric powerplants to connect with existing grids in the five-State area; and

Whereas five of the private utilities have now made application to the Congress of the United States to build portions of these transmission lines, which would result in the imposition of a "wheeling charge" which would increase the cost of electric power to the preference users at the expense of the consumers in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Association of Municipalities in convention assembled at Rawlins, Wyo., this 23d day of June 1961, does hereby go on record as supporting the construction of an all-Federal system by the Bureau of Reclamation for the electric transmission lines from the Colorado River Basin system, and as opposing the application of the private utilities to construct portions of said lines, and that this association further resolves that it is the sense of this body that the construction of said transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation will assure to the people of Wyoming a low-cost electric power for the future development of industries within this State, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Wyoming Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

GOSHEN COUNTY COOPERATIVE BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Torrington, Wyo., June 10, 1961.

At a regular board meeting of the Goshen County Cooperative Beet Growers Association, called by A. E. Olson, president, with Directors Homer Oxley; Ferd Zimmerer, vice president; Jay Knowlton, secretary treasurer; Charley Jones, Henry Schmick, Jr., and John Helzer present, the following resolution was passed on behalf of the beet growers of Goshen, Laramie, and Converse Counties, Wyo.

"Be it resolved, That as the beet growers of this area are not now receiving a fair profit on their farming operations and resent any action by the U.S. Congress that might in any way raise costs by permitting private power interests to construct and control electric transmission lines interconnecting the backbone lines of the Federal constructed system of the Colorado River storage project transmission system in the five States of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Wyoming. The assurance of a sufficient continuous supply of low-cost electric power is essential to the many beet growers of these counties. Members depend upon REA power for irrigation water pumping and the many operations necessary for feeding purposes as well as for domestic uses.

"Furthermore, if the private power companies are allowed to construct these lines, they will increase power costs to all preference users by their 'wheeling charge' with no firm commitment as to what this wheeling charge might amount to in the future.

"We, therefore, strongly urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to construct these transmission lines and keep the entire system under Bureau control."

For the best interests of all the people, this allocation and construction should be done immediately.

Respectfully submitted.

A. E. OLSON,
President.
FERD ZIMMERER,
Vice President.
JAY KNOWLTON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW DANGER IN RED ARMS "BUILD-UP"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my mail indicates that there are two classes of people in respect to analyzing the situation which Khrushchev has precipitated upon this globe. There are the complacent folk who sit back and who write about their own problems because of legislative action on the domestic front. There are also those in the other class, who feel the world is "going to pot," that the end is "just around the corner."

I have been one of those who have refrained from expressing a great deal of opinion on a subject about which no one really knows anything, because what will happen will depend upon Khrushchev.

Mr. President, in an already troubled world, Soviet Premier Khrushchev is further "stirring the pot." Witness the threats on Berlin; the publicly stated efforts to "beef up" Communist military forces; and the display of Red airpower in Moscow.

The West is now attempting to assess Khrushchev's threat and, as suggested, the propaganda he is sending out.

Undoubtedly Mr. Khrushchev is attempting to create a psychological pressure as a preliminary to what he hopes will be a Berlin meeting. For what purpose is he doing this? The answer must be to instill in humanity so great a fear of nuclear war that the West will be forced to cave in, or to at least indulge in substantial concessions.

The big question now really is, Can we have peace, or will we have war? What is the answer? Where are the "wiseacres" who know the answer? How critical will be the "showdown" in Berlin?

Yes, there are dreamers who think that all we have to do is to sit down with Khrushchev. We have done this through the years and gotten nowhere, but some think this time we can get somewhere.

In preparing to cope with the Soviet-created crisis, there is one thing we must do. We and our allies must prepare for any eventuality. Khrushchev alone must not be allowed to "set the stage" for negotiations, if there are to be negotiations.

Between now and any deadline set by Mr. Khrushchev, the West must, rather, continually emphasize in an eminently clear way that the Western Powers are in Berlin by right and obligation, and not by sufferance of the Communists; and that, if war arises out of the Berlin crisis, it will be "blood on the hands" of the Reds, not the Western nations.

Too, the West must refute the Red propaganda trick which attempts to show, as was so clearly demonstrated a few moments ago, that if nations resist Communist aggression, they are themselves aggressors. Of course, that idea is not swallowed by anyone in this country, and I do not think it is swallowed by anyone abroad.

Unless the West is successful in indelibly imprinting these factors on the world mind, however, Mr. Khrushchev may have a psychological advantage in any upcoming Berlin negotiations.

The United States and its allies must, first, gird themselves for whatever action, military or nonmilitary, may be necessary in protecting our rights in Berlin and elsewhere. And we must let Khrushchev know that we mean business in that respect. If we do so, it may be the deterrent that will prevent war.

Second, we must take full advantage of the time between now and Khrushchev's deadline to present our case to the world, so that the world will understand what we mean by saying we are standing pat, and we must point the finger of accusation right at Khrushchev to show the facts as they are.

I should like to take a moment to call attention to the world as it is today compared with what it was 22 years ago when I came to the Senate.

When we became a nation, we were laughed at by the European nations because our forefathers said this was a government of, by, and for the people. At that time Europe was far off. As I have said, when I became a Senator 22 years ago, days were required to cross the ocean. Now we are only a few hours away from Europe. The world has changed a great deal in 22 years, and in the change problems have been created. There has been a change in the physical nature of the globe.

Until the opening of the present century the world progressed very slowly. But in the last half century we have been really going strong. Twenty-two years ago there were no A-bombs. There was no overwhelming threat of communism. There was no intercontinental missile, which has brought Russia only 15 minutes away from us. When I came to Washington the world was relatively quiet. I remember those days very well. The world was very quiet.

A few years later at Hiroshima we dropped the bomb, which took 70,000 lives and wounded an additional 70,000. But now we have instrumentalities, as someone said, that could destroy all of New York City.

I state these facts because, according to much of my mail, America is concerned about the domestic policies and problems. A large number of our people are not awake to the changed world in which we are living, and the changed nature of the challenges that exist. They really do not realize that now we have communism to face, which 22 years ago we did not have.

APPORTIONMENT TO COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS OF ITS SHARE OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in conjunction with my colleague [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent to call up House Joint Resolution 472. My request is made with the permission of the majority leader, the minority leader, the acting chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 472) providing for the apportionment to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of its share of funds authorized for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have conferred with the distinguished junior and senior Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. SMITH], I have reviewed the facts about which the proposed joint resolution treats. I find present an incredible mixup or failure of understanding or communication between the Federal Bureau of Roads and the State of Massachusetts.

However, the relief sought jointly by the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. SMITH] does not in fact set a precedent for permitting a State to violate the maximum standards set in the act. I should like to point out that the joint resolution provides not only that the apportionment may be made, but it also provides that the money may not be obligated or expended so long as the State of Massachusetts has a legal maximum load limit above the maximum limits set by Federal law.

Do I correctly understand that to be the situation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding of the situation. As one Senator who hopes to be here next March, I certainly will not ask for a further extension of the law. We are very anxious to have the measure enacted, because we have had our troubles in Massachusetts, with our highway construction, to get our fair share of the apportionment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the situation. For the very first time Congress designated maximum weight and size limits for vehicles using Federal aid highways. We had theretofore proceeded to build highways sufficient to carry loads of a given dimension, only to have those limits increased, thereby making the highways inadequate. With the initiation of this vast highway program, on a bipartisan basis, costing many billions of dollars, Congress determined that it would be in the national interest and also in the interest of the trucking industry to establish uniform national standards and then to construct highways sufficient to accommodate traffic under such standards.

This decision having been made, we are proceeding now to build highways to accommodate traffic with these maximum limits now provided in law.

Therefore I am sure both Senators from Massachusetts and other Members of the Senate also will see how fallacious it would be now to build highways to carry certain weight limits and then to allow exceptions to be made which would render the highways, which are not even completed, already inadequate even before completion.

So it is with this understanding that I will not interpose an objection.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I realize the great interest which the Senator from Tennessee has had in the past in making it possible to set weight limits in the various Federal highways, and I compliment him for it.

House Joint Resolution 472 is a resolution which calls for emergency action. The Massachusetts Legislature in June of this year passed a law increasing the tonnage of trucks on the Interstate Highways from 60,000 to 73,000 pounds. The Bureau of Public Roads has advised the State and the attorney general of Massachusetts agrees that this Massachusetts act is in violation with Federal law. The result of this is that Massachusetts will be disqualified from receiving its apportionment of Federal Interstate Highway funds for the fiscal year 1963 unless the law is corrected. Unfortunately, the Massachusetts Legislature has convened for this year and will not meet again until January of 1962. I am, therefore, asking that this joint resolution be adopted so that the Massachusetts Legislature will be able to correct this oversight in its regular session.

I wish to emphasis that this Massachusetts act was innocently enacted into law, that there was no intention to evade the Federal law. In point of fact, the Bureau of Public Roads at one time advised people in Massachusetts that the act enacted by Massachusetts would be in conformity with public law. However, it now appears clear that the act is not in conformity with that law. I, therefore, ask that this House joint resolution be passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SMITH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

On July 1, 1956, the law of Massachusetts provided for a maximum gross weight of 60,000 pounds for construction-type vehicles and vehicles carrying petroleum products without specifying any axle weight limitation. A June 1961 act of the State of Massachusetts would increase the maximum gross weight of such vehicles to 73,000 pounds without placing any limitation on axle weights. Increasing the maximum gross weight from 60,000 to 73,000 pounds would have the practical effect, of course, of increasing the axle weight.

The General Cousel's office of the Bureau of Public Roads concluded that this act would violate the provisions of section 127 of title 23, United States Code for the following reasons:

Section 127 provides for (1) a maximum overall vehicular weight and (2) maximum axle weights. It does not require that there be any relationship between the two. Accordingly, determining whether a State law enacted subsequent to July 1, 1956, is contrary to section 127 requires that it be tested firstly as to the overall weight and secondly as to axle weights, each test being independent of the other.

Congress concluded that the maximum weights of vehicles using the Interstate System should be as follows:

	Pounds
Overall (gross) weight	73,280
Single-axle weight	18,000
Tandem-axle weight	32,000

Thus, the starting point in determining whether a State law enacted subsequent to July 1, 1956, would be contrary to section 127 is to test the law in light of the above maximums. So tested, the recently enacted Massachusetts legislation falls within the orbit of overall vehicular weight; it does not, however, satisfy the axle weight requirements for the reason that the law of Massachusetts places no limitation on axle weights, and a 73,000-pound overall weight would permit a single-axle weight exceeding 18,000 pounds and a tandem axle weight of more than 32,000 pounds to be imposed upon the highway.

Even though a State law does not provide for weights within the bounds of those specifically designated, a State law still may not be contrary to section 127. Congress realized that some States had laws or regulations in effect providing for weights in excess of those specifically prescribed. Accordingly, Congress provided, as an exception to the basic maximums, that if a State had a law or regulation in effect on July 1, 1956, permitting weights in excess of those specifically prescribed, then such greater weights are permissible. It is to be emphasized that weights in excess of those specifically prescribed must have been pursuant to a law or regulation, and such law or regulation must have been actually in effect on the critical date.

If a State had no law or regulation in effect on the critical date, it must conform to the specifically prescribed maximums, except for a single instance noted below. Since Massachusetts had no law or regulation in effect on July 1, 1956, governing axle weights, the proposed legislation would be contrary to section 127 since under the proposed legislation axle weights in excess of 18,000 pounds on a single axle or 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle can in effect be imposed on the highway. In this connection, it should be pointed out that since Massachusetts had no axle weight limitation in effect on July 1, 1956, the operation of a vehicle of 60,000 pounds in weight with its resulting axle load in excess of 18,000 pounds would be contrary to section 127 were it not for the last proviso of that section declaring that a State shall not be denied its apportionment of interstate funds if it allows the operation of any vehicle or combinations thereof which could have been lawfully operated within the State on July 1, 1956. This proviso, however, does not save the recently enacted legislation from being in contravention of section 127 for the simple reason that a 73,000 pound construction-type vehicle would not have lawfully operated on the highways of Massachusetts on July 1, 1956.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, it has been concluded by the Bureau of Public Roads that the proposed legislation would be contrary to the provisions of section 127. I am, therefore, asking that House Joint Resolution 472 be adopted so that the State of Massachusetts can correct this oversight.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with this clear understanding and the obvious inequity, and hardship which would be worked on the great State of Massachusetts, I will not only withdraw my objection, but will lend my support to the joint resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is now before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

RESEARCH ROCKETS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Friday, July 7, the State Department announced that it had issued a license to the United Arab Republic to purchase research rockets from private U.S. manufacturers. This followed by 2 days the firing, on Wednesday, July 5, of a rocket for meteorological research 50 miles into space by Israel.

In the present state of Near East tension, this coincidence—if indeed it is that—seems to be unwise, and is hereby protested.

Given a correlative effort and equal assurance of peaceful intentions in the United Arab Republic, there would be no objection to U.S. cooperation. However, when aid is based on nothing more than window dressing, and when Nasser and the United Arab Republic insist that they are in a state of war with Israel, the shipment of such rockets can only contribute to the dangerous atmosphere of an arms race already of much concern to the free world.

Mr. President, I have said nothing about this matter up to this time, because I wanted the State Department's explanation. I now have that explanation in the form of a letter from the Department addressed to me, under date of July 11. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1961.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In response to a telephonic inquiry from your office on July 10, I am happy to furnish you the following information and background regarding the recent purchase by the United Arab Republic of several research rockets from a private American firm in the United States.

Representatives of the United Arab Republic approached the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in May regarding the interest of the United Arab Republic in a program of scientific space research using sounding rockets. In accordance with a general policy to cooperate with other countries in peaceful scientific pursuits, NASA welcomed the opportunity to discuss cooperation in space science experiments with qualified United Arab Republic representatives. Following discussions here with these officials, however, NASA concluded that it would be unable to develop a cooperative program of mutual interest within the brief time span specified by the United Arab Republic.

We understand United Arab Republic officials subsequently contacted commercial representatives in this country regarding the purchase of several unclassified rockets for use in the proposed project. As a result of these contacts, the United Arab Republic agreed to purchase several small Javelin lower stage and Viper upper stage rockets of a type hitherto used for propulsion of sleds in connection with various types of research testing. It is our understanding that the United Arab Republic planned to use these rockets to study meteorological conditions in the upper atmosphere, including measurements of wind direction and velocity. As you know, this is somewhat the same type of scientific experiment as we have ourselves been conducting at Wallops Island and a large number of foreign countries, notably Italy, Japan and, most recently, Israel, have also carried out during and since the International Geophysical Year.

While the U.S. Government played no role in the conclusion of this commercial transaction, the export of all rockets is by law subject to the licensing procedures of the Department of State. Exports of Javelin and Viper type vehicles have already been made to a number of other countries, and we recently releasd a somwhat similar rocket to Sweden for atmospheric research. Several countries manufacture rockets of a similar type. Since these items are not classified and cannot be regarded as effective military weapons, no objection was raised to the export of these rockets from a security standpoint. While export of the entire number requested by the American firm was not approved, it was felt for the foregoing reasons that no basis existed for denying an

export license to the firm for a small shipment involving several vehicles.

I need hardly assure you that it continues to be the settled policy of this Government to cooperate with all countries interested in advancing man's scientific knowledge in the challenging fields of upper atmosphere and space. Likewise it remains a cardinal principle of U.S. policy that such activities should be entirely confined to peaceful pursuits.

I hope the foregoing information will be helpful in connection with the inquiry the Department received from your office. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the State Department assures us that there are no military implications involved in these particular rockets. Perhaps that is true, whatever may be said about how they might be converted or serve as a basis, with modification, for military use. The important thing is that we know that some weeks ago NASA was approached to sell these rockets to the United Arab Republic. NASA refused to do so, because there seemed to be no scientific basis for making these rockets available to the United Arab Republic. Then within 2 days after Israel does have a successful scientific achievement, which all free peoples should hail with joy—there are other countries doing the same thing, notably Italy and Japan—we now, through the State Department, give Nasser what he asks for, although he could not get it from NASA, just to help him out because he is a dictator, and dictators always like to show up well.

The only conceivable reason that anyone can assign for this action is that if we had not made the rockets available to Nasser, he could have got them from the Russians. Nothing is said about Nasser getting a great many things from the Russians, including arms.

Mr. President, how silly can we look, to be running after Nasser in this way, after he has used us, at Suez and in other situations, merely because he wants to destroy, as he has said, the Republic of Israel, which has now achieved this successful scientific development? What encouragement will other small nations be given to advance scientific development if we are to nullify their efforts in this fashion? It makes no sense. I hope we will not be guilty of such a blunder again. I rise to call attention to it and to protest against it. The action of the State Department was most shortsighted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO NEGOTIATES FOR U.S. ROCKETS—WASHINGTON APPROVAL SEEN FOR PRIVATE SALE—UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC IS VYING WITH ISRAEL

(By Walter Sullivan)

The United Arab Republic was reported yesterday to have negotiated for the purchase of research rockets in the United States. Washington is not expected to block their export.

These negotiations followed an attempt by Cairo earlier this year to obtain rockets through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Arab Republic wished to get the rockets in time for a firing this month, presumably in an effort to rival Israel's rocket program.

The scientific objective of the proposed shots—to release a sodium vapor trail in the upper atmosphere—was identical with that of the shot launched by Israel on Wednesday. Some weeks ago the Space Administration notified Cairo that achievement of a rocket shot of scientific value on such short notice was not practicable.

Then the United Arab Republic went into the open market.

PURELY RESEARCH ROCKETS

The sale of rockets to Israel's chief military rival is not likely to be good news in Tel Aviv, even though the vehicles are designed purely for research. Israel produced her own rocket.

On the other hand, the Space Administration would like to have Cairo join the growing international program of rocket research. Washington, likewise, must be pleased that Cairo turned to the United States, rather than to the Soviet Union, for its rockets.

The Arab Republic may have wished to achieve a launching in time for the anniversary, on July 23, of the revolution that brought to power the regime of President Gamal Abdel Nasser. It also presumably knew of Israeli preparations for the firing of Shavit II. (Shavit is the Hebrew word for comet.)

The Space Administration confirmed yesterday that it had been approached by Cairo scientists. It said that, while unable to participate in a program with such a brief timespan, it was interested in one that would not be so hurried.

Thus the Space Administration is carrying out coordinated rocket shots with Italy in a program that took 1 year to mature. It seemed to the Space Administration that, while it might not have taken a year in the case of Cairo, a rocket project could not have been prepared properly in a few weeks.

In the Italian-American program, rockets are fired into the twilight over Sardinia, in the Mediterranean, and over Wallops Island, off Virginia, as dawn moves around the earth. After an initial Italian shot in January, three pairs were launched from the two sites in April.

The Italians bought Nike-Asp and Nike-Cajun rockets from American producers for the Sardinia launchings and the Space Administration furnished the sodium vapor payloads. Some preliminary results have already been published by Italy.

The trail of sodium vapor glows in sunlight and can be photographed from the ground shortly before sunrise or after sunset. Its twists and turns, a few minutes after the shot, indicate wind directions and velocities at extreme elevations.

BEIRUT PRESS URGES ARAB UNITY

BEIRUT, LEBANON, July 6.—Israel's new space rocket drew headlines in the Arab press here today but the newspapers reacted with less alarm than expected. Some said it should teach the Arab countries a lesson in international cooperation.

Al-Jaryda noted that the meteorological rocket was sent up yesterday from a secret Israeli launching pad as Arab countries prepared for a fight against Israel's plans to divert Jordan River waters for irrigation.

"The rocket is aimed at the Arab defense council as much as at space," the paper said. It declared:

"Arab countries use foreign aid as a means of cursing, insulting and plotting against each other. * * * Israel is working on a scientific basis."

The Israelis insist the rocket is a scientific tool, not a military weapon.

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL SECTOR), July 6.—Shimon Peres, Deputy Minister of Defense, said today that Israel had given priority to her rocket program because of "grave defense problems."

"If other countries would change their belligerent policies," he said, "we could change our priorities."

Mr. Peres' statement came a day after Israel launched her first rocket from a site on the Mediterranean coast. His statement also came as a rumor spread across the country that the firing of another rocket was planned within 2 weeks. Some papers that carried reports on yesterday's launching and on plans for future launchings were marred by scattered white spaces where the censor had made deletions, presumably for reasons of military security.

The Defense Ministry, which supervised yesterday's successful firing, would neither confirm nor deny reports of plans for another attempt in 2 weeks.

According to the report in the newspaper Yedoit Aharanot, the next rocket will be larger than Shavit II, which was fired yesterday. The size of Shavit II, however, is still a military secret.

The newspaper report also stated that a tiny radio transmitter would be carried in the next rocket.

CLOUD SEEN FROM GROUND

Shavit II carried a charge of metallic sodium powder which was discharged at the height of the trajectory, 50 miles up, and formed a cloud that could be seen from ground. Direction and speed of wind were measured by tracking the cloud.

Meanwhile the effect of the rocket launching on the Arab world was being heard here with unrestrained satisfaction. It was learned that the Supreme Military Council of the Arab League would meet early next week.

Hatzofeh, organ of the National Religious Party, stated editorially today that Israel's rocket may serve as a "deterrent to the neighboring countries, bringing about a balance of power in the area."

WARNING TO ARABS

Omer, organ of the Histadrut, the general labor federation, said in an editorial: "We hope that the Arab countries will draw the correct conclusion, that Israel is strong and cannot be destroyed and that it would be better for them to accept her existence and to benefit from cooperation with her."

Haeretz, an independent daily, said that Israel "is capable of using this rocket for military ends as well, and sending it to greater distances over the surface of the earth."

WEAPON CALLED CONVENTIONAL

"This will be understood in Israel, in friendly countries and in hostile countries," it added, "and there is no reason to be ashamed of this; denials would only arouse suspicion. As long as the charge in the warhead is nonatomic, rockets are a conventional weapon."

After a Mapai Party rally last night Premier David Ben-Gurion said that Shavit II "had no military aim and had purely scientific purposes only."

He was asked whether the rocket could be put to military use and said: "There are things that I do not discuss. As for future plans by Israeli scientists, first let them send it up and then we will talk."

PLEA BY OTHER PARTIES

With general elections coming up August 15, other parties have been pleading with the Mapai not to use the rocket launching for electioneering purposes.

At one Mapai rally last night, Deputy Defense Minister Peres said that the name Shavit II had been decided upon to prevent the name Shavit I from being corrupted to Shavit Aleph. Aleph is the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet and a symbol of the Mapai

Party. "We would be accused of making propaganda for the Mapai," he said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the amendment under consideration the amendment designated "6-28-61—F"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I allow myself 5 minutes.

This amendment would modify the language in paragraph 2 of subsection (d) of section 105, which appears at page 15.

The purpose of amendment is simply to protect the appropriations processes and prerogatives of the Congress.

Subsection (d) of the act authorizes the use of foreign currencies obtained by the United States for the purposes of financing the various programs and activities authorized by sections 102(a)(1) and 102(a)(2)(i).

These programs involve the exchange of students, trainees, teachers, instructors, and individuals possessing certain specialized knowledge or skills.

Subparagraph 2, which my amendment modifies, authorizes the President to use these foreign currencies for the aforementioned purposes to the extent that such use is not restricted by agreement with the foreign nations concerned and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law and within such limits as may from time to time be established by Congress.

In other words, the President's authority to use these foreign currencies is by the above-quoted language restricted by such limitations as may from time to time be established by Congress. This would mean that a limitation could be either by an authorizing act of Congress or by an appropriations act of Congress.

I propose to amend this section so that the limitation on the President's use will be governed solely and exclusively by appropriations acts of Congress.

My amendment would strike out the phrase "and within such limitations as may from time to time be established by Congress, to use", and would insert in place thereof the phrase "to use in such amounts as may from time to time be specified in appropriations acts."

The single purpose of this amendment is to assure that these foreign currencies will be used only for such purposes and within such limitations and boundaries as are provided by the appropriations acts of Congress.

Mr. President, I discussed the amendment with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday in a colloquy between us. I understand the Senator from Arkansas is willing to accept the amendment and to have a vote on it. If my understanding is correct, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. We have considered the amendment. As a matter of fact, I feel that the language in the bill, by implication at least, would require the appropriation of the funds. I have no objection to the amendment and am perfectly willing to accept it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-28-61—C" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out through the period in line 4 on page 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 104 (a) Except as otherwise provided by subsection (b), the President may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this Act through such agencies or officers of the United States as he shall direct.

(b) In any case in which a power or authority conferred on the President by this Act is the same or substantially the same as a power or authority exercised immediately prior to the enactment of this Act by or through any agency or officer of the United States, the power or authority conferred on the President by this Act shall be exercised through such agency or officer until otherwise provided by statute or reorganization plan.

Redesignate subsections (b) to (f), inclusive, as (c) to (g), respectively.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this amendment is, in my opinion, one of the more important amendments which I have proposed to this bill, because if the amendment is adopted, it will assure that Congress will continue to play the role it has played in the past in assuring that our cultural, educational, and informational programs are operated on a well-balanced and well-coordinated basis.

My amendment proposes to rewrite subsection (a) of section 104. As presently written, this subsection grants the President authority and power to exercise all of his authority under this act through any agencies or offices of the executive branch, with the sole limitation on that delegation that his proposal must be brought to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and that thereafter a period of 60 days shall elapse before the delegation or transfer of existing authority will become effective.

Mr. President, this is where we get down to the real nub of the problem of fragmentation of efforts in the area of international communications, which I discussed briefly in my introductory remarks a week ago, and to which I alluded yesterday when I spoke of the problem confronting the Appropriations Committees and the Congress, arising from the fact that already there have been too many divisions of such authority and already it has spread into too many obscure areas of activity; and that we need to consolidate, clarify, and coordinate this program, rather than turn over the authority to any individual or agency of Government, to be broken down into further fragments and into smaller fractions.

We must realize that the authority provided by this bill—most of which is already in existence, by reason of prior acts—is now being exercised by several departments and agencies of Government. For the purposes of argument, I would be willing to say that most of this authority is being exercised in connection with programs and activities of either the Department of State or the U.S. Information Agency. These functions are being carried out in these agencies because Congress, either by statute or by approval of a reorganization plan, decided these particular programs could best be handled by these particular agencies. Thus far, they have been located in, allocated to, and identified with joint activities participated in by the Congress and by the Executive.

Section 104(a) of the bill, however, gives the President authority to shift these functions wherever he may choose, with the sole limitation that he must file his decision with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee for 60 days before it becomes operative.

Personally, I feel that we have enjoyed a fine partnership between Congress and the executive branch, in fostering, promoting, and developing these programs for foreign educational, cultural, and informational activities. The two basic acts in this area—namely, the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act—were congressional, not executive, innovations.

They originated in the minds of Representatives or Senators. They were evolved through the legislative process. They were accepted by the Executive. The executive agencies have embraced them enthusiastically; and the programs have achieved excellent results because—in part, I am sure, and in large part—of the partnership arrangements which have been enjoyed through the years.

I wish to see this partnership continue, and I most certainly do not wish to see Congress abdicate the performance of its responsibilities in connection with these programs. The present arrangement has, I may say, paid real dividends as a result of obtaining the benefit of the best judgment of the Members of Congress associated with the programs as to where these functions and programs can most effectively be carried out in the executive agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

Because it is impossible accurately to identify every program and every activity authorized by the prior acts which are consolidated in this bill, and because it is, therefore, impossible to determine with any accuracy where these functions are being carried out today, I personally feel that it would be unwise to grant to the President the almost unlimited authority to transfer these programs from agency to agency, as he might see fit. I have no opposition to his delegation of the new functions granted by this measure to whatever agency or officer he might choose to select for that purpose. These are new functions and programs, and I would certainly defer to the judgment of the Executive as to the agency or officer he might wish to select in order to have these new functions performed. But as to existing authority and functions, I believe Congress should have full opportunity, in accordance with normal legislative procedures, to examine and consider his proposal to shift these established programs from one agency to another or from one officer to another.

My amendment merely assures that Congress will retain that right. My amendment rewrites section 104(a), so as to provide that existing functions will be transferred only by statute or by reorganization plan. The language of the amendment is clear and is self-explanatory. This part of the amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 104. (a) Except as otherwise provided by subsection (b), the President may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act through such agencies or officers of the United States as he shall direct.

This amendment will leave the Executive with complete latitude to allocate and to delegate these powers wherever he may wish, insofar as they are newly created by Senate bill 1154.

However, subsection (b) deals with powers already in operation and with functions which are being carried out or functions under which operations are now being had, and have been had, in the main, for from 10 to 12 years—some of the functions which the Appropriations Committees have been accustomed to finding carried out in certain areas of activity of the Federal Government, so that those committees can interrogate witnesses and can keep abreast of the program, in connection with making provision of the necessary funds for their expedition.

Subsection (b) of my amendment provides:

(b) In any case in which a power or authority conferred on the Presidnt by this Act is the same or substantially the same as a power or authority exercised immediately prior to the enactment of this Act by or through any agency or officer of the United States, the power or authority conferred on the President by this Act shall be exercised through such agency or officer until otherwise provided by statute or reorganization plan.

In other words, this part of the amendment provides, in short, that as to existing programs which always have been handled by statute or by reorganization plan, any substantial changes or shifts in those areas shall continue to be handled by either statute or reorganization plan. The amendment would retain in Congress the authority to act in this capacity in the way it always has; and it has exercised that authority fruitfuly and well during the preceding years. In addition, the amendment will avoid the necessity of asking Congress to approve in advance, any reorganization plan submitted by the Executive—to approve it in advance, even before the Executive would have contrived the first syllable or word of the reorganization plan. In the absence of this amendment, the bill would grant to the Executive carte blanche authority to proceed with such a change or reorganization whenever he might wish to submit such a reorganization plan; and it would then be automatically accepted in advance. In my opinion, that would not be good legislation or good prudence. If that part of the bill, without my amendment, were to prevail, I predict that it would work a real injury on these very important programs, because it would tend to put Congress out of business, as regards being able to participate with the Executive in a joint decision as to who should be doing what and as to what should be done in each respective agency. I see no advantage to be gained from that. We have never suffered in the past because of failure of a necessary reorganization plan to be adopted or approved. I feel that the bill as it now stands would tend to create disenchantment among Members of Congress, who presently support this legislation because they understand it and because they have a part in it and because they vote for adequate appropriations for it. The bill in the absence of this amendment would make them feel that they were no longer able to keep abreast of what was being done or what was being planned in connection with this entire activity on our part in the cold war.

If we leave the bill as it is, therefore, I think we shall be setting up a potentially dangerous situation, in which various executive agencies will begin open and active competition with each other to obtain for their respeetive agencies the many functions authorized by previous legislation. Such bureaucratic competition and grave-robbing could, in my opinion, do violence to the overall effectiveness of our international communications program.

As I pointed out in my opening remarks, most of these programs are amalgams of various cultural, educational, and informational activities. I can imagine that there are many programs currently being conducted by the USIA which the State Department may feel are more cultural than informational; and, by the same token, USIA probably believes some of the cultural exchange programs presently operated by the State Department could be more effectively handled by USIA.

As a matter of fact, I have seen recent statements in the press indicating this rivalry and difference of opinion already exists.

Let us not delude ourselves. These interagency rivalries do exist. They are as old as Washington itself. I would prefer that these disputes be arbitrated by Congress through its normal legislative proceedings, or by the submission of a reorganization plan operating in complete harmony with all reorganization plans submitted by the Executive for other departments and agencies, rather than to turn it over to the President and his advisers, with the statement in advance that "Anything you choose to do in this regard from the standpoint of reorganization will be accepted."

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The amendment very clearly, on its face, is an attempt to freeze the present administrative pattern which prevails in the executive branch. With regard to the provision under discussion being an unusual one, I may say it is very similar to the provision which Congress, in Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt Act, adopted. In that act the authority is placed in the Secretary of State, rather than the President, but it authorizes the Secretary to delegate to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred on him by the act.

So the provision before us is similar to that one, but it gives the President, rather than the Secretary, discretion in the allocation of power and organization of the administrative machinery. I think this discretion is quite proper and very important.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to try to bring greater order and responsibility and centralization of authority into the administration of these programs. One of the few criticisms I have heard about the exchange program during the last several years is the fact that there is a certain amount of dispersion of authority. We have the USIA participating to some extent in this program, on a different basis, and for a different objective, although there is a great area in which there is overlapping. Some part of it, particularly in the field of books, is administered in the USIA, and the major part of the exchange of persons itself is in the Department.

Mr. Philip Coombs, who is Assistant Secretary of State with the largest responsibility for these programs, stated in the hearings that at the present time the administration had no plans for any major reorganization. But he was confident some improvement could be made in the organization in the future, and he thought it very important that the President should have discretion to do so.

It would seem to me to be a very great mistake to tie the hands of the President so that he could not change in any respect the existing pattern of administration. As I have said, even the Smith-Mundt Act recognized the necessity of change.

As I stated in my last speech on this legislation, one of the main purposes is to bring together in one place the activities which have been authorized by several different laws, which I have mentioned already and to which reference has been made. So, to that extent, it is absolutely necessary that we have the authority to bring these different functions together.

The proviso that we inserted in committee, which requires any change to be submitted to the Congress and to lie there for 60 days, giving an opportunity for it to be submitted to the respective committees of Congress and giving an opportunity to criticize or to make suggestions regarding the change, it seems to me is adequate safeguard for the rights of Congress.

This is a provision similar to that contained in the Atomic Energy Act. In that instance the committee is given notice of 60 days before any change is to take effect. It would have the effect of allowing us, if we had any serious misgiving as to any proposal, to register that misgiving, to make suggestions, and to discuss it with the administration.

I believe there is no need whatever for this amendment. In fact, I hope the Senate will turn down the amendment and adopt the provision as it comes in the bill. On this point I do not think there was any dissent in the committee on recommending the provision in the bill for adoption.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee whether by the provision included at the bottom of page 7, it is desired to retain in some way the congressional companionship in the bill, and to continue the partnership arrangement, which has served the cause so well for so long, rather than tipping the scale entirely toward the Executive and if so, why it was not provided, after the proposals were submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, that the committees be given authority or power to examine the proposals, comment on them, and reject them, if they proved to be undesirable? Although the committees would know about the proposals, I see no authority, in any way, shape, or form, for the appropriate committee to do anything but take a look at it, which makes that provision meaningless. It would be better to strike it out entirely than to create the illusion that we have some authority, whereas we have merely provided glorified, animated filing cabinets where the reports would repose in peace for 60 days, and then life goes merrily on despite any reaction the respective committees of the House and Senate might have to the proposed reorganization proposals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committees have inherent authority to inquire, comment, and make suggestions. It would be quite unnecessary to recite in the bill that the Committee on Foreign Relations has authority to examine and to comment and to express approval or disapproval of whatever proposal is made.

Mr. MUNDT. But there is no authority to act, is there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no authority to reject it. It is not a reorganization bill. It is exactly the same authority as contained in a similar provision that Congress provided in the Atomic Energy Act. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has exactly the same authority. It has worked very well.

In fact, we have two or three members of that committee on our committee, and that is the origin of this suggestion. It was said it had worked very well and had involved a partnership, as the Senator has called it, between the Joint Committee and the Executive.

The object of this proposal is to give the Executive an opportunity to improve administration, and not to tie its hands so there cannot be an improvement in the administration.

Mr. MUNDT. Could not that objective be achieved by a reorganization plan?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not think so. We think it is more difficult and clumsier, when there is major reorganization proposed. If they wish to follow that route, they have authority to do that.

Mr. MUNDT. This does not create new authority without resort to the reorganization plan procedure?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It provides similar authority to that provided in many bills. It is not unlike the authority provided in the Senator's own proposal, Public Law 402, for the Secretary of State. The Secretary was given the right to delegate to such officer of the Government as the Secretary determined to be appropriate any powers conferred by the act. It is not unlike that authority.

Mr. MUNDT. I am quite familiar with the provision granted for the Department of State. The Senator realizes, of course, that we are bringing into one theater of operations legislatively by S. 1154 a great many other activities, functions, programs, and powers than those included in the Smith-Mundt Act, because we are adding the powers of the Fulbright Act, certain features of Public Law 480, certain features of the Trade and Industrial Act, and so on. We are expanding the powers tremendously over the existing powers under the program established by Public Law 402.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These powers are all related; they are all in existence. The ones to be administered under the bill are very similar.

The Senator will recall that Public Law 584 had been in existence for some time—I believe about 2 years—before Public Law 402 was passed. The exchange aspect was delegated to the same officials in most cases. The people who are selected by the Board of Foreign Scholarships often are people who receive assistance under both laws; some of it in foreign currency and some of it from appropriated funds.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall conclude my presentation, Mr. President, by saying I was hopeful that perhaps I might induce the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment, because I think it would provide us with a greater assurance of the happy companionability which has existed between the legislative and executive branches as to the operation of the various acts, all of which I consider to be highly important. It appears the chairman is not going to accept the amendment.

I simply wish to make two points. First, it violates my sense of responsibility as a Member of the legislative body whenever we take action to approve in advance reorganization plans we have never seen and which we cannot contemplate. Second, I fear the repercussions will not be serviceable and constructive to the benefit of the programs we are seeking to expedite, to expand, and to emphasize by our actions today, because already Congress has too much difficulty in determining in what areas certain functions are being activated, implemented, and supervised. When these programs are to be shifted around as is proposed, simply by executive action, I feel it will do injury. I hope I am mistaken, because I hope the programs will succeed.

This is not an amendment I care to press, if I cannot induce the chairman to accept it by persuasion. I therefore withdraw the amendment, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment G and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 23, after the first comma it is proposed to insert "and", and in lines 23 and 24 it is proposed to strike out "and the expenditure of Government funds,".

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this is an amendment which I very much hope the chairman of the committee will accept. It is, in reality, a companion amendment to my first amendment, which has been adopted by the Senate and which was approved and commented upon favorably by the chairman of the committee.

This relates again to the problem of fiscal control by the Congress over the various activities of the Government. The amendment is offered because the language in section 108(a) is vague, and implies, at least, that the President is authorized to spend Government funds without any need for an authorization or appropriation by the Congress.

I grant that this is subject to interpretation. Some may say the language is not intended to have that result. I hope that is true. It could be true. Others may feel the language very specifically does do as I say.

All I ask for is a clarification, to be sure that the power of the purse remains in the hands of the people through their Representatives in the Congress. If it is the intent of the bill to give to the President the right to spend Government funds without any need for authorization or appropriation, then, of course, I think that would be bad legislation. I think that would weaken the whole cause we are trying to support in our efforts today. I am confident we would destroy any possibility whatsoever of the bill being passed by the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives under the Constitution is granted primary, first control over the purse strings. The House is rightfully and properly very jealous of its prerogatives. I cannot imagine the House of Representatives voting to transfer part of its appropriating authority to the Executive. I doubt that many Members of this body want to give that kind of blank-check authority to the President to run this or any other program, regardless of how meritorious we may feel the program to be.

We have had many arguments on this floor about back-door spending and control over the purse strings. I suggest in the amendment a simple clarification which, as I say, I hope and rather anticipate the chairman may accept. It would delete the words "and the expenditure of Government funds" on lines 23 and 24, page 22, so that the intent of the bill will be clear.

If there is any logical reason for having the language in the bill, I certainly would like to know it, because I do not believe it is actually the intention of the committee to grant this unprecedented authority to the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know whether the Senator is quite aware of it, but our report makes it clear that this represents the reenactment of the precise language of Public Law 860. We do not add or subtract anything. Since the bill will repeal Public Law 860, the language is precisely that in Public Law 860. This particular language has reference, for example, to the American National Theater and Academy, which is dependent for effective and efficient contract operation on Government funds, and is especially interested in it.

We are not adding anything at all. This is an example purely of codification of language. It is nothing new. It has been in the law since the enactment of Public Law 860.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is aware of the fact that the language is the same, but it is to be expanded now to include a great many other activities than those originally incorporated under Public Law 860. It is the expansion of the authority to include the other areas which gives concern to the Senator from South Dakota. The language goes much further, inasmuch as it will encompass all the various activities and all the various programs included under the bill.

I am confident that unless we maintain the traditional fiscal control over the program, the House will look upon this bill with a jaundiced eye and reject it. I am confident the Senate should reject it in such circumstances, because it is not proper, in my opinion, to turn over these kinds of spending programs to any executive. It is not necessary.

We have spelled out in the provisions how the money can be made available. I see no reason why we should proceed to add a new authority for the expenditure of Government funds per se, as it is set out specifically in the language, without sanction and action by the Congress.

I am very hopeful the amendment will be agreed to. I believe it will help the Senator and the committee to secure passage of the bill, if we can eliminate this new expansion of the authority for expenditure of funds by executive action. The other authorities would be retained.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will admit I do not think this is of too great significance, but since the authority is now in existence and has special application to the activities of ANTA and other activities under Public Law 860, it seems to me it would be bad to try to eliminate the language in that respect.

It is true that the provision does not apply in certain other areas of activity which are already covered in the law. The bill would broaden the law to some extent. But in view of the way in which the measure would apply to Public Law 860, I do not see any reason why the Senator should wish to restrict that provision. I know of no complaints or abuses about the application of the provision during the period of the life of Public Law 860.

Mr. MUNDT. Under Public Law 860, the provision is related to a very peculiar, specialized, and clearly defined function. In that law the provision has merit. But as pointed out on lines 18 and 19, page 22—"Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of this Act"—that provision includes all of such activities, some of them relating to large appropriations, because foreign currency would be involved, as well as Public Law 480. Large appropriations for other programs would be involved. It seems to me it would be only proper to correct that provision. With expenditures of funds of the kind contemplated, they should be kept within the purview of the functions of Congress. As they relate to Public Law 860, as I said, in strictly specialized form it is all right; but to make the provision operating procedure for all activities under the measure, it seems to me would be going altogether too far. I respectfully suggest to the chairman of the committee that he delete only a few words—"and the expenditure of Government funds"—as they appear in section 108. Then if it becomes important to continue the authority for the specific act as it existed before, I certainly would not resist an amendment which could be offered to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator from South Dakota be satisfied if the language were restricted to apply only to the area to which it now applies? I believe the language would be "The functions authorized in section 102 (a) (2) and (3) may be performed," et cetera.

Is that the procedure that the Senator is afraid would be applied in other cases?

Mr. MUNDT. If the provision were limited to the programs to which it now applies, I would have no objection. I object only because it would apply to anything in the present act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The staff gave me a memorandum, which indicates that during the period of President Eisenhower's administration 23 different laws were waived. I have a list of them.

I do not believe there is any danger in it as the provision now appears in the bill, but if the Senator feels very strongly about the subject, I do not think I would feel too bad if the provision were cut back to have the same application as it has under Public Law 860. According to the staff member present, I believe the language would then read:

> The functions authorized in section 102 (a) (2) and (3) may be performed without regard to——

Mr. MUNDT. To what lines does the Senator refer?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Lines 19 to 22.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, as I understand, the Senator would scratch the word "hereunder" and specify the places where the act would become operative?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall be happy to withdraw my amendment, and to support the substitute suggested, if the Senator from Arkansas will offer it. I think his modification would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the understanding that we have arrived at, I withdraw my amendment and yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that on page 22, line 19, the words "authorized hereunder" be stricken, and that there be inserted "authorized in section 102(a) (2) and (3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this time I call up my amendment E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to strike out "10 per centum" and insert "5 per centum".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am hopeful that with respect to the present amendment there may be a meeting of the minds, because I share with my distinguished friend, the chairman of the

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, with whom I have worked for a great many years in close harmony on bills of this type, his desire to give some degree of flexibility in the allocation of funds.

My real concern is that we have gone too far in this connection when we permit a full one-tenth of the money to be transferred without any specification by Congress. I know how careful the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State affairs deals with such subjects, because I have served on the committee for a long time. I know how reluctant we are to make appropriations in any area where there is great flexibility, because we feel that we lose the direction for which the money was intended. I recognize the validity of the position of the committee and of the chairman of the committee that there should be more flexibility, because we are living in a world of change. So, primarily, I merely suggest that the degree of flexibility be neither zero nor 10 percent, but that the percentage be set at 5 percent, which is a considerable amount of money when it is totaled, because we are dealing with large amounts. I would not deny the right of flexibility. But to agree that one-tenth of the amount in each appropriation bill may be shuffled around without requests coming to the committees of Congress would weaken the force of the argument of those who are trying to get adequate appropriations, because members of the committees of Congress are naturally reluctant to vote large appropriations when they do not know what is to be achieved.

I wonder if my good friend would agree that perhaps a 5 percent flexibility would be adequate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amount was arrived at by the administration. It should be stressed that under the present language of the bill, no appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 10 percent. Since the appropriation for the overall program under S. 1154, exclusive of foreign currencies, is not likely to be much over $40 million in the near future, any transfer could not represent more than $4 million—and the actual maximum might be smaller.

In effect, then, this proposed amendment says that expenditures for the programs under S. 1154 may be permitted to rise from $40 million to $42 million, but should not reach $44 million.

The following examples illustrate the need for a high level of transfer authority:

In fiscal year 1960, ICA allocated $4 million to "Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad"; in fiscal year 1961, $2 million. It is understood that something in the neighborhood of $4 million may be proposed for fiscal year 1962. It is also understood that officials of ICA have become convinced that the actual administration of such programs for American-sponsored schools abroad is best handled by CU—Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in State. On such an assumption, it would be desirable to transfer such funds from ICA to CU. A 5-percent limitation on such transfers would prevent them entirely since even $2 million is more than 5 percent of CU's estimated appropriation for 1962. Estimate is based on the budget as submitted to Congress; namely, $38.2 million.

During the past year, a need arose rather suddenly for 300 4-year grants at $3,100 per grant annually for scholarship programs for African students south of the Sahara. The cost of such 4-year grants has been estimated at $900,000 per year, or a total obligation of $3,600,000. Such scholarship programs have in the past always been conducted by CU. However, in this case, CU's funds were so limited that nothing could be allocated for this purpose. ICA, on the other hand, could finance them. If the proposed limitation of 5 percent were operative, when a similar situation arose, funds could not be transferred from ICA to CU for such purposes.

I believe that is a very good example of how a need will arise where one agency which is the interested one in reality finds that the money has been given to ICA, because Congress has been very generous with that latter agency and there has been very little in the way of unobligated funds or very little of any funds in the exchange program in the State Department.

A somewhat similar scholarship program involving Guinea and the Congo for 450 students at $4,500, or $2,025,000 overall, was initiated by ICA, even though, as in the example above, it was generally admitted that such a program was more properly one for CU to administer. A limitation of 5 percent on transferability of funds of this type would prevent such a sharing of responsibility for certain programs between ICA and CU.

I believe one of the reasons for some of the so-called confusion between these programs has arisen from the fact that there was no transferability between the two agencies.

Another example of the need for such transfers at a reasonable level is afforded by a current item which we understand is contained in the State Department's appeal for the restoration of funds in its 1962 appropriation request. That appeal concerns some $600,000 necessary to continue a program of effective contacts with Japanese labor leaders. The item was specifically rejected on the House side on the grounds that mutual security funds were originally used and so should continue to be used. However, the ICA is no longer operating in Japan. The need for this labor program continues, and ICA, as well as other agencies, is deeply interested in its continuance. If the restoration request is denied, this authority in S. 1154 presumably would be the only recourse.

Therefore I submit that while there is nothing sacred about 10 percent as against 5 percent, the Department recommended 10 percent, and the committee believes that this is a reasonable amount. It is not mandatory. In several instances which have come up during the past year there would have been required a transferability of some 10 percent to be effective so far as any of those programs was concerned. If the bill were a huge one, like the mutual security program, running into $3 billion or $4 billion, it would be quite another thing. However, this program is a relatively small program. We do have transferability of 10 percent, I believe, in the mutual security program. It has varied in that program from year to year and as between different activities. In that case, a great deal of money is involved. But here it is in the neighborhood of $4 million. That is all that can be transferred from one agency to another.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator were willing to amend the bill so that what he believes and what he has said could be written into law, the Senator from South Dakota would gladly join him in making the amount 10 percent. The difficulty is that the 10 percent extends to moneys appropriated to any department or any agency in Government in furtherance of the act. So we are dealing with billions of dollars, not millions of dollars. If he wants to amend the language to have the 10 percent apply only to money in this act, I will join him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It cannot raise the money of this program more than 10 percent. That is written into the act. It is not 10 percent of all other programs. It is of the programs authorized under this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me read the language. I read from the bill:

> Moneys appropriated to any department or agency of the Government—

This can be the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, or any department. The bill states "any department or agency of the Government." The agencies are innumerable.

> Moneys appropriated to any department or agency of the Government in furtherance of the purposes of this act—

Let us examine what the committee says the purposes are. In two words, it is the cold war. That is a big enterprise. We want to win it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator go to the next phrase?

Mr. MUNDT. The purposes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The significant phrase is:

> But no appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 10 per centum by reason of transfers pursuant to this paragraph.

In other words, no appropriation can go to more than 10 percent of the amount covered by the proposed act.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator has in mind giving 10 percent flexibility to the appropriations under the bill I will join him in supporting such a provision. Then we must change the language in line 16, page 14, to clarify the situation. However, when the Senator expands it to cover the mutual security program and the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture, because this says, "for the purposes of this act," which purposes are spelled out in section 101, that is a different situation. The purpose is stated as:

> The purpose of this act is to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other

countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made by their respective economic and social systems toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world.

That is what we do with ICA. That is what we do with mutual security. We send out teams. We are going to send the members of the Peace Corps also, but they are not being paid much. However, we send out teams of experts to teach people how to run censuses, and other projects.

My first impulse was that I could not support any kind of flexibility. However, I share with my distinguished friend the desire to provide some flexibility. I will be happy to make it 10 percent, as far as I am concerned, of the money appropriated for this act. If the Senator from Arkansas insists on keeping the whole bundle of appropriations that are used in this direction, which runs into high figures, I will blink my eyes and say I will go along with 5 percent. It is a pretty big sum when we go to 5 percent of any money appropriated to any agency working in this field.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator may be misinterpreting this language. It is clear to me. I have stated what the committee believes to be the situation, namely, that the limitation applies to whatever source the money comes from. I have already stated that it will be in the neighborhood of $40 million, which would make it $4 million. That amount certainly is not enough to upset the Government, by any means. I believe that the language clearly means that if the amount appropriated under the proposed act is $40 million, then the limit on any sum from any act—ICA or any other—would be $4 million. There is no possibility of the extraordinary enlargements of the program the Senator mentions.

Mr. MUNDT. If that is what the Senator has in mind——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the committee believes the language means. That was the intention.

Mr. MUNDT. I am perfectly confident that, with the way the language is written, we could involve appropriations to any department or agency included in any of the innumerable activities of the cold war. That could run into billions of dollars. If we want to have flexibility, why do we not take out, on line 16, the words "Moneys appropriated to any department or agency of the Government," and insert in lieu thereof "Moneys appropriated in furtherance of this act"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may be misunderstanding the Senator. The purpose of that language is that when money is appropriated to the ICA for a similar purpose, such as the labor leader grant, it may be brought from the ICA into the administration of the proposed act, but limited to 10 percent of the appropriations in the act. In other words, the language at line 20—"but no appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 10 per centum"—applies to the amount that may be brought in.

I think that means any appropriation to be made under S. 1154.

If that is satisfactory to the Senator from South Dakota, I would be willing to accept language to that effect, "No appropriation in pursuance of this act shall be increased by more than 10 percent." But the source of it comes from some other place; for example, the ICA. The point was that the ICA had the money to grant the particular scholarships I have mentioned, and the State Department did not have it. It was a situation in which the State Department had the administrative machinery. Everyone admitted that the State Department could do the work most efficiently, but the Department did not have the money. It would have been very convenient and efficient if the money could have been turned over to the State Department to administer. Instead, it was necessary to inject the ICA into an activity for which the ICA was not best equipped. That is the whole purpose of the language. It is not actually intended to increase the amount vastly at all. It is for flexibility in administration.

As the language read, and the way I still believe it reads, it means that no appropriation in pursuance of this act will be increased by more than 10 percent, no matter from what source, whether it comes from the ICA or any other branch of the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps where we have our misunderstanding is that the Senator from Arkansas believes, if I understand him correctly, that under the operation of the act it would be so limited that no particular function authorized by the act could be expanded through appropriations by more than 10 percent. I believe that up to 10 percent of the money appropriated for any department of Government engaged in the furtherance of the purposes of the act could be transferred. If we could spell this out to show specifically what the Senator from Arkansas believes, that is what the Senator from South Dakota would like to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a suggestion, after the word "appropriation" on line 21, I suggest the insertion of the words "authorized by this Act shall be increased by more than 10 per centum." The clause would then read:

> But no appropriation authorized by this Act shall be increased by more than 10 per centum.

That would certainly hold the appropriation within that amount. I would be perfectly willing to adopt that language. I think it would be satisfactory.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that that would perhaps achieve the purpose. The Senator from Arkansas may be correct. I am not certain that I am right. It could be subject to interpretation either way. I want the language to be precise.

Mr. President, with that understanding, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment. After the word "appropriation" on line 21, page 14, I propose to insert the words "authorized by this Act," and then to delete the word "decreased." The language would then read:

> But no appropriation authorized by this Act shall be increased by more than 10 per centum.

The word "decreased" would not then be applicable, so the words "or decreased" should be stricken.

Mr. MUNDT. There may be some function under the act which would necessitate a little decrease so as to transfer the amount to some other function. I think the word "decreased" should be allowed to remain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have any objection to that. Then I will not suggest the deletion of the words "or decreased." The language of the amendment would then read:

> But no appropriation authorized by this Act shall be increased or decreased by more than 10 per centum.

The net effect is to insert after the word "appropriation" the words "authorized by this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while we are moving along with comparatively noncontroversial, clarifying amendments, I have an amendment which I believe the Senator from Arkansas will accept. I call up my amendment designated "6-28-61-I," and ask that it be read. I call this amendment up now, because the rest of my amendments are more controversial and will involve more discussion and perhaps yea and nay votes, so I should like to permit our brethren to have more time in which to enjoy their lunch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 20, immediately after the period it is proposed to insert the following new sentence: "Not more than six members of the Commission may be members of the same political party."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rather hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. I have the honest feeling that the omission of such language was a pure oversight on the part of the committee, because every other advisory committee which has been created in this field has been bipartisan in nature. I can think of nothing which would be more injurious than to exclude the minority party from membership on these purely advisory committees or commissions. Heretofore on advisory committees, such as those dealing with Public Law 102, the Voice of America program, and the exchange program, we have not only welcomed but have sought complete support across party lines. I do not think anything has occurred to change that situation. I would simply restore for the new Advisory Commission on Educational and Cultural Exchange the same setup under this act and provide for not more than six members of the Commission to be of the same political party. That is as we have provided heretofore.

If I have misunderstood the intent of the committee, and they really wish to shunt the minority party out of the program, I desire to argue the point further. If I am correct in assuming that the committee wishes to have the Commission operate on a bipartisan basis, and will accept the amendment, I should like to be so advised.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The proposal was not overlooked. The committee considered it. The real thought is that this kind of activity should be nonpartisan rather than bipartisan. Most of the persons who are considered for this kind of position—it is a nonpaying position—are academic persons of high standing, who have never been involved in politics. It was thought that this would be a step forward, rather than to continue to require them to register their allegiance politically and to swear that they had been voting regularly. That, we believe, is an irrelevant circumstance under these conditions.

I know it has been an old custom, but it has always been my hope that we might move on to a nonpartisan attitude in this sort of activity.

If the Senator from South Dakota insists upon the amendment and holds that this ancient practice must be considered, he can, of course, submit the question to a vote. I shall not fight it. It is not a matter of great moment. I feel certain the program can prevail. I simply hoped the question would not be raised. The Advisory Committee on the Arts, under Public Law 860, has never been treated in that fashion. Generally speaking, I know I have never paid any attention to the politics of the persons who comprise such boards, and I do not believe anyone else has. Usually, they hold high positions in the great universities, and to my knowledge no inquiry of this nature has been made. I have heard there has been some difficulty in ascertaining the politics of the presidents of some universities, and, whatever their activities have been, they have played no particular part in their service.

I do not see that this is a matter of great importance. It certainly is not the intention to exclude either Republicans or Democrats. There is no political profit or material profit in these appointments. They are honorary in nature, and I think those who are appointed to the positions are of a high caliber. I do not believe it is wise to put this kind of board on a partisan basis.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely because it is in harmony with the very persuasive and proper statement of the chairman of the committee, I believe it is highly important to continue to keep these boards nonpartisan by making them bipartisan. I am not impressed by a man who is ashamed of his politics. I prefer those who are willing to be identified as a Democrat or a Republican or a Socialist; I like Americans to stand up and state their views.

All these causes are designed to promote Americanism and freedom. There has never been a tinge of partisanship on such commissions before. A part of the board has been Democratic and a part has been Republican, as the chairman says, because they have been selected on that basis. However, unless one went around and made inquiry he never found out which were Republicans and which were Democrats; they have all operated as good Americans.

Simply to shunt the Republican Party out because it does not happen today to be in the majority position would, I think, be unwise; just as I thought it was unwise in the 80th Congress, when the Republican Party was in control, not to provide specifically for representation of the minority party. Hence we specifically provided for bipartisan representation.

I think it is important that there continue to be bipartisanship on this Commission. It is important that we provide for listening posts for prominent Republicans and prominent Democrats, who can go back to their respective friends, respective councils, and respective conventions and say, "In this area we join as Americans; there is no partisanship."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator would agree to language such as the following, to be added in line 20, on page 18, "and no political test shall be applied to their selection."

Mr. MUNDT. No, I am not quite that naive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think a political test is applied now. When there is a Republican President, I think it is quite natural that he has more Republican friends, and tends to put nice, well-intentioned Republicans on the board; and I think a Democratic President is inclined, similarly, to appoint to such a board some of his good Democratic friends or other Democrats who are nice and have good intentions.

But if there is to be bipartisanship, the only way to have it is to have representation from both parties, by capable, useful persons. Through the years the operations under that arrangement have been successful. Therefore, I see no advantage in scuttling the bipartisan program which has worked, and setting up in its place one which would openly be partisan. I hope that at this late date partisan representation is not injected into the performance of such functions. Rather than have a partisan advisory committee, I would prefer to have none at all. If there are to be appointed both Republicans and Democrats, with each group watching the other, they will operate in a nonpolitical manner. In the past, all sorts of attacks have been leveled against such agencies, but never has a charge of partisanship been leveled.

I was in hopes that this omission from the bill was an oversight; and I hoped the chairman of the committee would agree to the adoption of the amendment, and would say, in that connection, that the present plan has worked well in the past, and therefore should be continued.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not think this is a matter of major importance. I do not think the future of the program is dependent on the action taken on this amendment, either one way or the other.

I do not know whether inclusion of the words "on a nonpartisan basis" would appeal more to the Senator from South Dakota.

But the idea of bipartisanship is, in my opinion, rather meaningless. What happens, when there is a Republican administration, is that the Republican President appoints certain "captive Democrats." There were all sorts of "Democrats for Eisenhower"—which, in my opinion, was an insult to the party. It is no great achievement to find a so-called captive Democrat who happened once to vote for a Democratic candidate, and to appoint him. I would prefer to have an honest-to-goodness Republican appointed, instead.

I do not think this program will become a matter of partisanship, because there is no great profit in it, one way or the other; there is only a great deal of hard work.

If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to have a vote taken on his amendment, let the vote be taken. But I oppose the amendment, because I think it makes little sense, and would not result in the appointment of good, honest party members.

If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to distort the proper nature of such a board, certainly it could be done by having the Democratic Executive appoint certain so-called captive Republicans. But I do not think that should be done.

When the Executive nominates good persons and when the nominations are confirmed by the Senate, I think that is the proper arrangement. Certainly it is the privilege and prerogative of the Executive to make the appointments, and that is all right with me.

I do not know what are the politics of these appointees. I have not had a constituent solicit me for appointment to these boards, and I do not think one from my State has been appointed. I do not want to be in the position of favoring the appointment of a partisan person to the board.

I do not know whether the president of Yale University is a Democrat or a Republican. It makes no difference to me what his political affiliation is, for if he is good enough to be the president of Yale University, he is good enough to be a member of this board; and he should not be excluded from it simply because he is a captive Republican or a captive Democrat.

So I oppose this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a moment I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. But I do not believe that my distinguished friend really believes that a Democrat who serves on a bipartisan board under a Republican administration or a Republican who serves on a bipartisan board under a Democratic administration is a captive creature and is without worthwhile attitudes. If so, all of our bipartisan board arrangements should go into the wastebasket.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe they should insofar as our foreign policy is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. Because in that event we would have appointed only captive creatures who would not be worthy of

serving there. But I do not believe these appointees have been "captives." We have had good boards.

If the Senator from Arkansas insists on keeping this program exclusively a Democratic one, no doubt he can succeed in his purpose, on the basis of a rollcall vote. Perhaps I shall lose in my attempt to have this amendment adopted. But I shall not join in an attempt to say that now the time has come to apply a political test, and that these positions shall be given to the friends and associates of the President and his friends, without having bipartisan representation.

I think there should be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to this amendment. In a moment, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but in the meantime I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who wishes to speak on an extraneous subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the subject to which I shall address myself is not exactly extraneous, although it is not directly related to the pending amendment.

I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from South Dakota in yielding to me.

Mr. President, I wish to address myself to a related subject; namely, the export of plays and motion pictures from this country, under the guise of cultural activities, to other countries.

Recently, my attention was called to two plays which have been performed at Westport, Conn. One is called "The Zoo," and the other is called "Miss Julie."

I wish to read a letter I have received from one of my constituents. The letter refers to these plays, and will give the Senate the picture of what I have in mind in connection with the matter of cultural representations to other countries.

The letter comes from Mrs. Harold Peffers, of Danbury, Conn., and reads as follows:

THE D. G. PENFIELD CO.,
WHOLESALE GROCERS,
Danbury, Conn., July 6, 1961.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH,
Washington, D.C.

MOST HONORABLE SIR: Yesterday, July 5, 1961, I went to see these plays, "The Zoo" and "Miss Julie" at Westport, Conn.

I got up and walked out before the first play ended—and before the end of the second play most everyone left the theater—they were so terrible.

One woman we talked to said she felt as if she had fallen into a pile of manure, another said it was all right if you liked garbage.

Now, Senator BUSH, these plays are going to be sent to South America as an example of American life. Whoever is in charge of this department must be an enemy of the United States and we wish you could do something about it—talk about lend-lease and armament—forget that and look into things like this. Here is where the Communists are working mostly, homosexuals and pinks. Please, please do something about this.

Respectfully,

NATHALIE R. PEFFERS,
Mrs. Harold Peffers.

Attached to the letter is a clipping from a Connecticut newspaper. The clipping reads as follows:

DOUBLE BILL AT WESTPORT

Adlai Stevenson just had a rough time in South America.

And now the Laurence Henry Co. (Laurence Feldman and Henry Weinstien) are dispatching the New York Repertory Co. into that area.

Two of the plays that will be in the repertory were displayed last night at the Westport Country Playhouse—"The Zoo Story" and "Miss Julie."

If a man of Stevenson's stature found it rough going, it seems to me that these two plays (the company has others in its repertory) are poor selections.

"The Zoo Story," by Edward Albee, is strictly a conversational piece between two characters. William Daniels and Ben Piazza carry on the long flow of talk that ranges from homosexuals to dogs. At times it is smart and witty but generally it is just long-winded. However, the acting is good with Piazza getting the best of the long one-acter.

Viveca Lindfors has to struggle to keep "Miss Julie" entertaining. And she does well, considering the load she has to carry. It is a terribly dated show taking place around the turn of the century in a country estate in Swèden and involves a one-night affair between a girl and her father's valet. Morgan Sterne plays the valet and Betty Field is lost as a maid.

The two plays will be at Westport through Saturday night. On Thursday and Friday afternoons there will be performances of "I Am a Camera," which will be part of the troupe's repertory.

Mr. BUSH. Here is another letter on the same subject:

I understand after attending the theater (Westport Playhouse) this week a certain drama group will present the filthy plays "Miss Julie" and "The Zoo Story" to the Argentine people. At this time we are in need of prestige. These plays to my judgment do not represent America as I know it. What is the matter with our people? Is our morale at this low level?

Again, I have another letter. I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the letter from which I just read be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. BUSH. I read from that letter:

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Wednesday I went to the Westport Playhouse to see two plays that are going to South America on a Pan American good will tour. Enclosed is a piece from the Bridgeport Post.

That is the clipping I have already spoken of and asked to have printed in the RECORD.

At least 50 people walked out of the theater and many said they would write to Washington to stop such filth going to South America. It depicts the worst side of U.S. life. It was the story of a degenerate—filthy and boring—it would do our country much harm.

I am not a prude and never wrote a letter like this before but please investigate.

Yours truly,

KATHERINE B. WILSON.

Of Southport, Conn.

I appreciate that this is not a bill on which we can legislate matters of this kind, but I was distressed to learn from the Department of State that the company referred to is to take these two plays to Latin America—Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro, and Sao Paulo in Brazil. These stops are to be made between July 11 and August 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. May I have another 3 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 3 more minutes on the bill to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I mention this appropos of the Senator's amendment, which has to do with the appointment of the commission, because I believe that if an advisory commission on international, educational, and cultural affairs is to be established to replace the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, this is the type of thing that should come under the purview of that Commission, and such a commission should feel some responsibility to recommend legislation to Congress to stop exporting the very worst depictions of American life, which present our people as being morally depraved.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. If my amendment prevails and there is representation of both political parties on the commission, every member on every side can have somebody to whom he can go when matters of this kind come to his attention.

Mr. BUSH. I do not doubt it. I do not doubt that, with or without the amendment, the plea would not fall on deaf ears. I believe anyone worthy to serve on that commission, of whatever party affiliation, or if he had none, would feel some sense of responsibility in connection with the matters about which I am talking.

I think we realize, from reports we have had, from books we have read, the export of many of our motion pictures has done us irreparable harm in countries. When we are permitting the continuation of the export of this type of entertainment, which purports to give a picture of American life, we are offsetting the good that comes from cultural exchange programs.

Can anyone imagine the Russians sending to this country the types of plays we are talking about? They send us ballets, dancers, musicians of the best quality. Those they present to us are considered, and probably do, represent the best side of their cultural life. Yet we take no steps to prevent the export of the worst side of our cultural life, in spite of all the State Department can do.

I have talked with the head of the USIA, Ed Murrow, privately. He said there is nothing we can do under existing law to stop or prohibit the export of this kind of entertainment. It is done privately, and he has no authority to hinder, delay, or affect this type of travel by American entertainers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas would yield some time to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

In permitting the export of this type of entertainment without restraint, we go a long way toward vitiating and liquidating the efforts of Ed Murrow and the USIA and the effect of the cultural exchange programs we are talking about today.

My plea is not for an amendment to the bill today, but it is that it not fall on deaf ears, and that if we do establish the commission which is proposed, the plea I make should come before the commission. I intend to call it to the attention of the commission. I believe it should study the whole problem and see whether or not it is worthwhile to recommend legislation which will give the State Department or the USIA some authority to prevent travel and entertainment that will serve only to liquidate the good work that is being done all over the world at the taxpayers' expense.

I think the export of filthy and immoral performances as being representative of U.S. life is shameful. I think the time has come for the Government to take a hand in the problem to see what can be done to control it.

I thank both the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Arkansas for yielding time to me.

EXHIBIT 1

DEAR MR. BUSH: I understand after attending the theater (Westport Playhouse) this week a certain drama group will present the filthy plays "Miss Julie" and "The Zoo Story" to the Argentine people. At this time we are in need of prestige. These plays to my judgment do not represent America as I know it. What is the matter with our people? Is our morale at this low level?

Thank you again.

Mrs. L. R. CLASE.

EXHIBIT 2

JULY 6, 1961.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Wednesday I went to the Westport Playhouse to see two plays that are going to South America on a Pan American good will tour. Enclosed is a piece from the Bridgeport Post.

At least 50 people walked out of the theater and many said they would write to Washington to stop such filth going to South America. It depicts the worst side of U.S. life. It was the story of a degenerate, filthy and boring. It would do our country much harm.

I am not a prude and never wrote a letter like this before but please investigate.

Yours truly,

KATHERINE B. WILSON.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that, despite the unanimous consent under which we are operating, the Senate lay aside the pending business and that I may call up Calendar No. 472, Senate bill 1873. I do so because of the grave drought and grasshopper situation in the Northwestern part of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator how long it will take?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I may say that if it takes 4 or 5 minutes, it is worthwhile. The bill was reported by our agriculture committee unanimously, and I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is not a bill that was reported this morning. It was reported yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, it is a 2-year extension of the livestock loan bill, in which so many Senators representing Western States are interested. I made inquiry this noon, and I understood there was no objection in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, nor in its immediate consideration, since it is urgent and the time limit may be imposed very shortly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the bill was unanimously reported by the committee. There appears to be a need for it. It carries out legislation which was in effect 2 years ago. There was no need for it in the last 2 or 3 years, but there is now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does this bill deal with livestock loans or grasshoppers, or just what situation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses.

The other bill to be considered today is the livestock loan bill, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such act to July 14, 1963.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Both of these measures are emergency matters and should be adopted. Another bill was referred to by my colleague.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill was approved favorably today by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and is not on the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But may we have the assurance of the distinguished majority leader that it may be considered promptly tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has the assurance of both the minority leader and myself that it will be called up promptly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So the bill on haying for drought disaster areas will be considered tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; if it is on the calendar. I want to say for the RECORD that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], along with the other Senators who joined in the proposal, has been a stanch advocate of this program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator. I thought this relief should have been permitted under the original emergency legislation, but it is special legislation and it should be adopted.

DONATION OF DAIRY AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1873) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses," approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 899), in order to permit the use of donated foods under certain circumstances for training college students.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 472, S. 1873?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses", approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 899), is amended by striking out the period at the end of such Act and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including college students if the same facilities and instructors are used for training both high school and college students in home economics courses."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK LOANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 471, S. 1710.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1710) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such act until July 14, 1963 and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1710) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such act until July 14, 1963, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Until", to strike out "July 14, 1963" and insert "December 31, 1961", and on page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof", to strike out "July 14, 1967" and insert "December 31, 1961"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(c) of the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1148a–2(c)), is amended

by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence, "For a period of four years from the effective date of this subsection", and inserting in lieu thereof, "Until December 31, 1961,".

(b) Section 2(c) of such Act is further amended by striking out in the second sentence thereof "July 14, 1961", and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1961".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill is of immediate and of very great importance in the livestock areas where the drought is now pressing very hard. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with a request for immediate passage.

As a brief statement, the bill, with the committee amendments, would revive the authority to make emergency livestock loans until December 31, 1961, and would extend the authority to make supplementary advances to borrowers under the program until December 31, 1961. I know of no objection at all to passage of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that Senators on both sides of the aisle in the committee felt this was an emergency measure. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator yield to me, Mr. President, for one question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the extension, will there be a limitation to areas which have been designated as disaster areas?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The bill would simply authorize the Secretary to again make emergency livestock loans. The law has never applied except in emergency cases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator. I hope the bill will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the author of the bill, relative to his position on the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS

The measure now before the Senate, S. 1710, amends the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under the act until December 31 of this year.

There is no question about the need for the passage of this bill. Twelve other members have joined in cosponsoring it. Many ranchers in my State of Utah and elsewhere in the West are in distress because of prolonged drought, imports of sheep and cattle, and increased expenses without a corresponding increase in income. A serious credit situation has developed. Immediate assistance can best be provided through reactivation of the special livestock loan program.

The program was first authorized in 1953, primarily to assist livestock owners in maintaining basic herds during the period of prolonged drought and unstable livestock prices. Under the original authority, loans could be made to new applicants only through July 14, 1957, but the authority was extended to authorize loans to indebted borrowers until July 14, 1961. This bill will extend until the end of this year authority to make loans to both new and indebted borrowers.

Ranchers conducting family-type operations are eligible for consideration under the Farmers Home Administration regular operating loan program. However, this program is not adequate in its present form to finance many of the larger livestock operations now in trouble in my State and throughout the West, and it is obvious that the expanded program contemplated by S. 1643, the Agricultural Act of 1961, cannot be enacted before the July 14 expiration date.

The special livestock loan program has proved sound and highly successful in the past. Approximately $90 million has been loaned, with more than 93 percent paid back, with interest, to date. Officials of the Farmers Home Administration anticipate that total payout will approach 98 percent.

The program will not require specific appropriation since the Secretary of Agriculture already has the authority under Public Law 38 to use the revolving fund provided for emergency loans for special livestock loans.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for the dispatch with which he has moved, as chairman of the Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, to take action on this bill in time to meet the expiration date and the loan emergency, and also to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] for his cooperation.

The need for extending the emergency livestock loan program was first brought to my attention by George M. Smith, general manager of the Producers Livestock Loan Co. in Salt Lake City, and this legislation has the support of the Utah State Farm Bureau, Utah Wool Growers, and other farm organizations.

Mr. Smith's letter, together with a letter to Mr. Clarence A. Anderson, State director of the Farmers Home Administration in Utah, are attached to this statement.

PRODUCERS LIVESTOCK LOAN CO.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 28, 1961.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSS: Last week a meeting was held in the office of Mr. Clarence A. Anderson, State director of the Farmers Home Administration, during which many of the problems confronting the sheepmen of our State were discussed at some length. Since then similar discussions have been had with representatives of the Farm Bureau and both the State and National Wool Growers Associations. It was the consensus of opinion that some of the problems were deep seated and would take time to resolve. On the other hand, the matter of proper financing through this period of adjustment becomes a complex thing and of such proportion that companies such as ours, the PCA's, and a relatively few banks that make loans on livestock are unable to carry the burden without some help.

Legislation was passed in 1953 authorizing the Farmers Home Administration to assist primary lenders in financing sheep and cattle men under an arrangement known as the special livestock loan program. Legislation providing the same kind of assistance is needed again to insure continued operation of many outfits beyond the current year.

A copy of my letter confirming the meeting in Mr. Anderson's office is enclosed for your information, and your wholehearted cooperation and support of the proposed program is urgently solicited.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

GEORGE M. SMITH,
General Manager.

PRODUCERS LIVESTOCK LOAN CO.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 27, 1961.

Mr. CLARENCE A. ANDERSON,
State Director, Farmers Home Administration, Salt Lake City, Utah

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This will have reference to the meeting held in your office a few days ago concerning many serious problems confronting sheepmen.

One of the oldest industries known to man is on its knees and literally being forced from its rightful place in our economy, largely because of steadily rising operating costs and diminishing returns realized from its production of wool and lambs. These are factors beyond control of the sheepmen and his dilemma has been worsened in recent years by drought.

As you know, our company with farm credit assistance, together with two or three banks which survived the depression of the early 1930's gave of their time, energy, and resources to save and mainain a substantial number of both sheep and cattle men in the West who would otherwise have been forced out of business. Had this leadership, encouragement, and financial aid not been made available to them there is good reason to believe that the livestock segment of our western agricultural economy would be negligible today.

In recent years because of the ever-increasing demand on banks for furnishing working capital to various business enterprises, financing of automobiles, appliances, etc., it has been difficult if not impossible for sheepmen and livestock operators generally to obtain financial assistance except through organizations such as ours and the Farmers Home Administration.

Since the officers and directors of our company are sheep and cattle men we have adopted a philosophy of faith and hope in the future. However, as mentioned, increased costs for labor, equipment, taxes, etc., further magnified by unreasonably low returns in the case of lamb and wool has resulted in continuous retrogression in position of most of our range sheep loans. We are aware that some operators have no place in the industry and would not be successful under the most favorable conditions.

On the other hand the great majority are honest hard-working citizens with substantial investments in their operation who need only time, we feel, to reappraise their individual situation and work collectively in solving deeper problems existing in the industry.

Our capacity and that of the PCA's to carry all of them through this period, is of course limited, and unless a program within the Government can become operative along the line of the special livestock loan program established in 1953 whereby joint financing of these hard-pressed people can be done, many sheepmen in this and adjoining States will be required to liquidate their outfits at sacrificed prices and further damage to our economy.

We have met with representatives of other lending organizations and are seeking support from the State and National Woolgrowers Association and intend requesting aid and assistance of our Senators and Congressmen in helping to resolve this situation.

We urgently request that you as State Director of the Farmers Home Administration

communicate this problem to your people at the Washington level so that they being fully apprised of the sheepmens' plight will lend their full effort and cooperation toward bringing about legislation which we feel is a must at this present time if the sheep industry as we know it in the West is to survive.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE M. SMITH,
General Manager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1710) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such Act until December 31, 1961, and for other purposes."

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

On line 19, page 18, after the word "appointed," insert "on a nonpartisan basis."

I should like to offer that as a substitute for the Senator's amendment "I". I am ready to yield back my time on the amendment and vote, if the Senator is willing to yield back his time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this proposed substitute is nothing except saying the same thing over again as a parliamentary ruse to avoid a yea-and-nay vote on the very fundamental issue set out in my amendment.

What we are trying to decide—and it is a question for the Senate to decide—is whether at the present time Republicans should be included or excluded from service on the Commission. For 12 years we have had language providing that not more than a majority of the Commission members should be members of the same political party.

I object to the proposed amendment for the same reason that I object to the original language proposed to be corrected by my amendment. The substitute simply provides that the President may appoint members from one party only, if he wishes to do so. I think that is bad, whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat. It is not authority which we should give to a good man, and it is not authority which we should give to a bad man. I think it will seriously weaken the wonderful, bipartisan support we have always had. Members of the Commission have been reporting both to Republican and Democratic associates.

The advisory commissions in the past, when they have had trouble getting appropriations, have gone to their friends on both sides of the aisle to try to obtain adequate appropriations. I see nothing in the record of the past 12 years, during which we have had bipartisan support, which would require a change to eliminate the bipartisan nature of the Commission.

By simply saying "nonpartisan," instead of providing the language we have always had, we would reiterate, in a different phrase, the language in the bill as it is presently stated. I submit that if we are going to have advisory commissions trying to recruit friends for important programs, we could do no better than to select people who are Republicans and who are Democrats. They reflect the genius of our two-party system much better than do nonpartisans.

Therefore, I object to the proposed substitute to my amendment, because it is certainly simply a different manner of accomplishing what the committee language already would do. It would exclude the right of the minority party to representation on the boards and commissions. If that is to become a congressional policy, and if that is to become the attitude, it ought to be written into law by a yea-and-nay vote.

I think it would be a big step backward from a program of bipartisanship which has worked successfully for a dozen years. I do not think the need for political patronage is so great that we should change the fine formula which has given us success for so long.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 3 minutes from the time on the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Arkansas that his amendment is not a substitute amendment, in that it would fall at a different place in the bill. It would therefore have to be treated as a separate amendment, and therefore would not be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be made to apply to the end of the sentence on line 20 of the bill. That is the same place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In lieu of the language offered by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In lieu of the language offered, as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then it would be a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I understand exactly what is being done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of line 20 on page 18, in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] it is proposed to insert the following:

The members of the commission shall be appointed on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will accept the modification. I would strongly support it. I feel this is not a Commission which should be considered on a political basis at all. The suggestion that the appointments are to be made on a nonpartisan basis, I think, is quite within the spirit of the bill. It is much more likely we can obtain qualified people to serve on the Commission if we approach it in that atmosphere, than if the commission is felt to be a partisan Commission and a person has to be either a Republican or a Democrat to be a member of it.

I regret to say that in my State—and I think this is true of many States in the United States—some 40 percent of the voters are not enrolled in either party. Voters can register in my State and vote for either party without enrollment in either party. I should not wish any language in the bill to exclude 40 percent of the voters of my State from being members of a Commission.

I hope the modified language will be accepted. I think it is quite appropriate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate very much the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut. He has expressed what I have in mind.

I know a great many people who are neither Republicans nor Democrats. It is not that they are ashamed of their politics, but they may not be alined permanently with either party. Many leading people, especially those in the academic field, do not wish to be classified or to have to go through a public examination as to their party politics.

That is all I seek to do. All of us who are in politics and who are party members are not ashamed of it. We do not hesitate to declare our party membership.

I think this kind of a function should be performed on a nonpartisan basis, and the people should be selected without respect to politics on both sides. I believe it will be done in good faith. I do not for a minute think that either a Republican President or a Democratic President would deliberately seek to use this kind of appointment to reward party workers. This is not the kind of position which is sought. This kind of position is rarely sought by party workers, largely because there is no remuneration in connection with it and it is an activity which requires a great deal of work for very little reward.

I hope that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senate will accept the amendment.

While I am on my feet, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that I have been handed a note by a member of the staff, which points out that the Actors Studio Group or the New York Repertory Company produces plays such as "Miss Julie" and "The Zoo Story."

They have announced that they are going to Latin America. But this production is in no way sponsored or financed by the Department of State and the group should not be confused with the American Repertory Company. They are quite different companies. The two plays the Senator mentioned are not in any sense financed or supported by the Government.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I am glad the Senator has made that point clear. I did not mean to leave any doubt on the point. My plea is directed to this problem. Companies like the subject one are able to go abroad, not only without any help from the Government, but without any permission or supervision, and regardless of whether their productions are entirely in conflict with what we are trying to accomplish through the proposed program, the USIA, and like efforts.

My plea is that we should not undo with our left hand what we are trying to do with our right hand. Because of plays such as those we have discussed and some of the salacious and immoral movies that we export to distant countries, the time has arrived for us to take cognizance of the problem. For that reason I thought the Commission which would deal with cultural affairs might make it its business to examine into the situation and perhaps to recommend some proposed legislation to Congress that would give the State Department, the USIA, the Passport Department, or a combination of those organizations, some control over the export of plays, entertainment, or what not, that may be deleterious to the national interest, and entirely in conflict with our foreign policy, our cultural exchange policy, and other policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. The problem is an extremely difficult one. I recall that some time ago I took a trip to Japan. The biggest hit on display was a movie called "Psycho," which I understand is one of the great productions of the movie industry in this country. If we were to produce 10 programs of that type, the handicap for us to overcome would be considerable, because such pictures are shown to millions of people around the world, when in comparison we can only reach a few thousand with our exchange programs. I agree that the problem is great, but I do not know what the answer is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to point out that for 3 years the suggestion has been made that we ought to enact legislation to give the State Department some discretionary power in the issuance of passports. We have not been able to get action on such proposed legislation. Today, therefore, Communists can apply for a passport to go to Russia. The State Department issues such passports. For 2 years I have been arguing that some action ought to be taken on the measure. Until I found out today that contained in the unanimous consent agreement which applies to the bill before the Senate is a rule of germaneness, I contemplated offering an amendment to include the proposed legislation on passports. I think that if such a measure were passed, we might be able to reach the panderers who are distributing licentious pictures throughout the world, showing plays that bring upon us the hatred and shame of the people who see them.

Two years ago a licensor of film from one South American State appeared before the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. He said:

> All the good that you do with your foreign aid program is more than destroyed by the type of pictures that you are sending to our country.

I point out that reaction because the time has come when proper legislation in this field should be passed. Otherwise, we might as well say that Communists may go all over the world from the United States to spread propaganda and speak against their own country.

In effect we say, "We give you carte blanche authority."

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I know that the chairman of that committee is desirous of having enacted that type of legislation. We asked for an opinion from the State Department 5 months ago. Such opinion has not yet come forth. I say that the time is at hand when some action should be taken and some declaration made on the subject.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I am pleased to hear both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Arkansas speak on this subject. I hope that perhaps the discussion today on the floor of the Senate may lead to some action in connection with this highly important subject. I think it is time to stop presenting ourselves abroad in an untrue light, and that some steps should be taken so that a great organization like the USIA will have some control over the educational and cultural content of material that is exported from this country to our friends abroad, and will be able to prevent the export of entertainment and cultural programs which serve to debase the United States in the eyes of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, I heartily second the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Ohio with respect to the interpretation of America that is being given by the export of films and other productions. Only last Saturday and yesterday I saw the crowds lined up in queues to enter some of the motion picture theaters in Mexico City. The fare that the patrons were to receive, as suggested by the pictures on the boards and on the marquees advertising the shows, certainly left one ashamed and discouraged because, as the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut have said, the filthy films that are being exported and shown in various large cities of the world are carrying a message that is untrue so far as America is concerned, and they do far more harm than we can counter by the expenditure of many millions of dollars through USIA.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. MUNDT]. It should be unthinkable that a political connotation should be given to this program. The amendment offered by my colleague is certainly in keeping with the efforts we have made to have programs of this sort not partisan, or bipartisan, at the most. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, does the Senator from South Dakota yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I do not. Under the negotiations that took place yesterday by which a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, I am not sure how the subject was to be handled. So I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary to establish a quorum not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire as to the division of the time which remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each side has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has offered an amendment to the effect that of the nine members of the Advisory Commission to formulate and help to formulate policy under the bill, not more than six shall come from any one political party. That would make it a bipartisan Commission. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas would make it a nonpartisan Commission, not a bipartisan one.

I hope that when the vote is taken on the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the amendment will be rejected, and that the Senate will accept the version offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may inquire whether the law as it is now constituted provides for a bipartisan commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding is that the existing law so provides.

Mr. AIKEN. Of five members, not more than three may be of one party?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the proposal of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is to give the majority party a little larger percentage of the membership of the Commission than is permitted by the law which has been in effect in recent years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am curious to know just what is meant by a nonpartisan commission. Does it mean that a man who is a member of a political party may not serve on the Commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I think that what the distinguished Senator has in mind is that the President is not inhibited as to whom he shall appoint. He may appoint all from one party or all from another, if he likes; or he may appoint persons who have no identity with either party.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The thought is that their merit or intellectual interest or capacity to serve is the determining quality, not their membership in a political party.

Mr. RUSSELL. The connotation of the word "nonpartisan" is, in some places, a person who is not affiliated with either of the parties. Oftentimes on the eve of elections, nonpartisan slates are formed which are composed both of Republican and Democratic candidates. At least, that is true in my State.

I had always rather assumed that a nonpartisan commission, as a practical matter, was composed of persons not affiliated with either party. This is the first time I have heard of a nonpartisan commission of this kind, because usually commissions are comprised of members of both parties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt that it would. The language reserves very broad latitude to the President to make appointments. However, I believe the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota should be followed. I think it has a little more importance than the importance attached to it by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

First, the bill provides that members of the Commission shall represent the public interest. A broad public interest is involved. The Commission is supposed to represent a cross section of public interest. Their functions will be, as the bill states, to recommend to the President policies for exercising his authority under the act. In other words, the Commission will make recommendations to the President, and those recommendations will relate not only to the educational exchanges and to the selection of people, but to the cultural exchanges, as well.

I shall point out now why I believe it is important that the Commission be bipartisan. It goes back to the contribution made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut about a dramatics company which, I understand, is now going to the Argentine or somewhere else in South America, offering as U.S. culture something which is at once filthy and pornographic, and which certainly is at variance with every concept of decency that I know anything about. If that is culture, then I want no part of it. Yet the Commission is to advise with respect to policies to be followed and with respect to all the things which will happen under the bill.

They are to select athletic groups; they are to select influential individuals; they are to select distinguished personages; they are to select artistic and dramatic groups. The sky is the limit.

In consequence, I believe the minority has some interest in the so-called public concept. I believe we are entitled, in that sense, to be consulted through persons who will be appointed to the Commission and in whose selection we may have a chance to make a recommendation. It does not follow that the President must consult us particularly about the appointments; but it would be following a good, sound, traditional line. It has been done always in connection with every agency that articulates any kind of policy whatsoever.

So the Senator from South Dakota is in good form when he offers the amendment. It is in the best of tradition. Also, I think it affords a distinct safeguard, because I should like to see people—some people, at least—who, if they disagree with the kind of policy established, will prevent the kind of thing to which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut alluded. At least a protest can be uttered, and the protest can be made public, so that if any discipline is to be invoked, it can come from the public side.

I hope, therefore, that the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas for the Mundt amendment will be rejected, and that the Senate will accept the modification of the bill suggested by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I always find it difficult to differ with my respected and revered leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and with the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]; but I do not believe that in this instance partisan politics should play a part.

The bill provides that the members of the Commission, who under the Fulbright amendment would be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, must be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. I cannot conceive of these appointments being made on a partisan basis, even by an administration that is as politically partisan in some respects as the incumbent administration, without it becoming evident on the floor of the Senate. But I have enough respect for the incumbent President, as I did for President Eisenhower, to believe that in such a situation he would try to select persons qualified in the field of education and culture, so that the Commission would be above criticism of any kind, politically.

The Senator from Arkansas has stated that if the members of the Commission are appointed on a political basis, many persons who are eligible and are highly qualified for the work will be excluded. In the past 8 years, I have regretfully seen some highly qualified persons rejected by my own party for appointment because they were members of the opposite party, although the posts for which they were to be considered were not political at all. They possessed the special knowledge and special talent in a given field, in which they were well qualified to represent the United States on a board or commission of real importance to the United States.

So with the greatest reluctance, I feel compelled to try to dissociate this matter from party politics. Being very proud of my own State's position in cultural and educational affairs, I think I can say that the position which I take this afternoon would be highly acceptable to the people of my State and to those in other centers of education and culture throughout the United States. I do not believe this proposal should be brought into party politics.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that neither party has any monopoly on the dramatic talent, the ingenuity, the artistic talent, or the intellectual talent of the country. He will find a wealth of it in both parties. So the President's selections will in that sense not be limited.

The other point is that this is a good pattern to follow. I think it follows the old Jeffersonian admonition: Nail it down in the law; then there will be no concern about it from then on.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. If the language of the Mundt amendment is placed in the bill, it is suggesting that the appointments ought to be made on a partisan basis. The Senator from Illinois and I agree that it should not be on a partisan basis. But if the bill provides that six members may come from one political party, that certainly suggests the kind of division which must be sought. I do not want to see that happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We who support the Mundt amendment do. That is the difference.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Apparently the Senator from Connecticut is not aware of the fact that this kind of bipartisan commission has been in existence for the last dozen years. It is written into the law and has provided that very excellent group of officials, some from his own State, who have worked for the advancement, progress, and promotion of the purposes of this act.

This is not a new departure. The departure comes when the chairman of the committee and the committee suggest that there no longer be such minority representation on the Advisory Committee.

Mind you, Mr. President, the bill would then provide that six of the nine members may be members of one party. I think such a 2-to-1 majority should be satisfactory to the other side. They say

they want a bipartisan foreign policy. But evidently they want it only in theory, not in practice. They would specifically exclude bipartisan advice..

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the Senator's amendment, could not nine nonpartisan members be appointed to this Commission?

Mr. MUNDT. Of course.

Mr. AIKEN. All of them could be nonpartisan members—perhaps all from the State of Connecticut, for instance.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. That shows what happens when the loading up of a commission is begun.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois that it is better to have the law provide what we mean. But let us stop talking about foreign policy bipartisanship if we do not really mean it. If the Republicans are not to be consulted, but are to be barred at the door, let that be set forth clearly.

Certainly these matters are important. Before the inauguration of the bipartisanship policy, the selections for appointment to such commissions were made on a partisan basis. As a result, the picture of a circus fat lady was shipped to many countries; and the result was that the program was virtually ruined at the start.

That demonstrates why it is proper to have on the Commission a few members identified with each political party, so they will help decide who shall represent America in connection with programs which are sent to other countries.

There has been no criticism of this program under bipartisan support, except now, under the decision by those on the majority side to plow us under—which probably will be done, as a result of rejection of this amendment. I am sorry to see that done. I do not believe it serves the cause, for Senators to say, "We want this program to be the monopoly of a single political party."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, years ago we went through an experience in this field with the so-called cultural art projects, under the old WPA. Having had an interest in the theater, myself, I remember when the touring companies went through the country. They had an advisory group of their own, and they selected the vehicles for presentation. I remember when they erected a tent in southern Illinois, and then performed certain dramatic presentations. The list was one of the most amazing I ever saw. At the University of Michigan there was a dramatist by the name of Avery Hopwood. His plays were represented by bedroom farces. One, which that company played, was entitled "Up in Mabel's Room." Another was entitled "Getting Gertie's Garter." At that time I used to keep myself abreast of the developments with those playrights. But it was one of the most fantastic things I ever saw in all my life, and the plays were performed helter-skelter all over the country. We did not have on the board anyone to give dictation when Franklin Roosevelt selected those who would run that project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time available on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I maintain that this matter is far more important than the distinguished Senator from Arkansas admits. Even if only a few representatives of our side are on the Commission, so long as they have a good, sound American concept, I think the program will be kept fairly well on an even keel. That is what is sought by means of this amendment, and that is why the amendment is important.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would an amendment to the Fulbright substitute be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order, for it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill, as amended by the committee amendments, is now regarded as original text, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is, in effect, an amendment in the first degree. The Senator from Arkansas has submitted to that amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is not the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] a perfecting amendment? Has a motion to strike out been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment does not insert a new paragraph; it merely perfects a provision already in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think a fair construction is that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is in the first degree; and that a substitute for that amendment might be offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], but that the substitute is open to amendment—in other words, an amendment of the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is in the second degree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it was offered as a substitute. If it is a substitute, it is not an amendment in the second degree, I respectfully submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A substitute amendment is an amendment in the second degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do not the rules permit an amendment to be offered to a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That depends upon the situation. In this situation, such an amendment is not in order.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know that I have the floor.

Mr. BUSH. I understand that the Senator does have the floor. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Why does not the Senator suggest that the Senator from Arkansas modify his amendment accordingly, if the Senator from South Dakota wishes to submit an amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a modification to suggest, but I am a little doubtful whether the Senator from Arkansas would accept it as a modification.

Mr. BUSH. Why not try him out?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment I was going to propose as an amendment or an addition to the substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas would strike out the period, and would insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That not more than five shall be members of one political party.

That would not destroy—instead, it would buttress—the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, if he were disposed to regard it in that light.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I have been seeking to make is that the partisanship of the prospective members of such a commission is an irrelevant consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In whose time is the Senator from Arkansas now speaking?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does any time remain under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I now yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Such an amendment would require that the party affiliation of all the members of the Commission be ascertained. That would force it to be constituted on a partisan basis. My objective is to ignore completely that particular aspect. I believe it is not pertinent or relevant to this measure, and has no place in it at all, to provide that ascertainment shall be made of the party affiliation of the members of the Commission. The objective was to ignore the matter of party affiliation. Senators will notice that the original bill did not mention it at all. I suggested the words "nonpartisan," purely in an attempt to allay any such suspicion.

Perhaps these words mean different things to different people. The late Senator Vandenberg said, as I recall,

that he preferred the word "nonpartisan" to the word "bipartisan."

In other words, I have had in mind the thought that in connection with the consideration of foreign-policy matters, no attempt should be made to evaluate them in accordance with a party platform or any other domestic party matter. Perhaps that is an oversimplification. In any event, all I am seeking to do is say that in the appointment of the members of the Commission, their qualifications shall be considered from some point of view other than that of party affiliation.

I noticed in both the last administration and the one which preceded it that the political qualifications of such appointees seemed to have no real significance. Those in the administration would try to hunt up some poor fellow who was called a captive Democrat or a captive Republican. All that only forces a certain amount of hypocrisy upon the appointing officers. I think it is much more dignified and far more effective to simply ignore party affiliation. So whether the Senator offers 2, or 5, or 6, or 10, it is the same with me. I would rather not mention in any respect the party membership of the members of the Commission.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota respects the point of view which the Senator from Arkansas has expressed. He recognizes immediately that when it is provided that not more than five, or six, or three should be members of one political party, it does require the ascertainment of whether or not the others are members of a political party.

In the kind of program we want to submit to the rest of the world, we will get better programs if we insist on conviction rather than insist on political membership.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Having, in my career, exercised the appointive power, frequently I was confronted with the need of making a decision when the law was completely devoid of any instructions about the political complexion of the prospective appointees.

As for myself, I always felt the best type of administration was obtained, whether it be on a court or a board or a commission, when there was a practically balanced division of the membership. There should not, and usually there cannot, be a completely balanced division. Hence, when I had to make appointments, even though I was not bound to appoint a Democrat or a Republican, I tried to balance the bench, the board, and the commission.

With the forces which operate under appointive powers, I do not believe we will be able to say, "We will pick these nonpartisan college presidents or college professors." I do not think it works out that way.

For that reason, I shall support the proposition that there will be better administration if there is a practically evenly divided political complexioned composition on the board. The minority of three will militantly oppose improvident, imprudent proposals. The purpose of a minority is to check the majority when the latter wants to go in one direction unrestrained.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not know whether there are any other requests for time. I am ready to ask for a yea-and-nay vote, if no other Senator wishes to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time? He has 1 minute.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not prepared to yield back the remainder of my time until I am sure there will be a rollcall.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. I am ready to vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Are there further requests for time?

Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The vote will come on the Fulbright substitute for the amendment which I offered. My amendment would restore and retain the bipartisan nature of the Board, leaving with the majority the right to appoint six of the nine from its own party, but no more than six. The other three would not have to come from the minority party, but could come from no party at all. At least it would prevent all nine coming from the same political party. It would provide for bipartisan representation and preclude political monopoly.

The vote is on the substitute, and I am prepared to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Arkansas for the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 92]

YEAS—56

Anderson	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hart	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Morton
Burdick	Hickey	Muskie
Bush	Hill	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Pastore
Cannon	Jackson	Pell
Carroll	Javits	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Randolph
Church	Jordan	Smathers
Clark	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Dodd	Magnuson	Stennis
Douglas	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gore	Metcalf	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Dworshak	Russell
Allott	Eastland	Saltonstall
Beall	Fong	Schoeppel
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Scott
Boggs	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kuchel	Thurmond
Capehart	Lausche	Tower
Carlson	Long, La.	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Miller	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Prouty	
Dirksen	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—10

Bridges	Hartke	Long, Hawaii
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Moss
Chavez	Kefauver	
Goldwater	Kerr	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT'S substitute amendment for Mr. MUNDT'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the substitute to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED VISIT TO CONGRESS BY PRESIDENT MOHAMMAD AYUB KHAN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since there is a goodly contingent of Senators present in the Chamber, I should like to ask the majority leader what the program will be for the remainder of the afternoon and also for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires as to which Senator yields time on this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 2 minutes under the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I wish to state that the remainder of the afternoon will be taken up with the bill now before the Senate, but it appears doubtful that consideration of the bill can be completed today.

It is anticipated that there will be no business involving voting of any kind after 4:30 today. If Senators wish to remain and make speeches beyond that time, that will be fine, but there will be no other business.

Tomorrow the Senate will convene at 12 o'clock. Immediately upon the convening of the Senate there will be a live quorum call. No business will be transacted under the morning hour until the Senate returns from the joint meeting in the Chamber of the House of Representatives to hear President Mohammad Ayub Khan of Pakistan. Very likely there will be votes immediately on our return to the Chamber from the joint meeting. So I would like to put all Senators on notice and express the hope, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, that all Senators will attend the joint session tomorrow as a mark of esteem and honor to our distinguished visitor.

Following completion of action upon the cultural exchange bill, it is the intention to take up the bill on oceanography (S. 901), and following completion of that bill it is intended to consider the bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission (S. 2043). I understand that both those bills will entail some debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I call up my amendment 6-28-61—D, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to strike out "and, whenever it would further the purposes of this Act, for the dependent members of their immediate families,".

On page 12, lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out "or dependents of participants".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, on the bill I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I call attention today, as I have done on previous occasions, to a situation which, if not clarified and corrected, can have very serious effect upon both our domestic and foreign policies.

I refer to the determined effort of the Department of Agriculture to reduce the agricultural production of the Nation, while at the same time the State Department is insistently urging long-term foreign commitments on an expanded scale.

While the food supply of America is not the only factor in our international programs, it is indeed an indispensable factor and one without which all our other efforts would prove inadequate and possibly fruitless.

We know from experience that in a cold war, a hot war, or the war against poverty, disease, tyranny, or intolerance, food is the most powerful weapon of all.

It is the one indispensable weapon, and without it wars cannot be won.

Throughout history governments have fallen for want of food, and wars have been started and lost by food-short nations.

Since World War II, thanks to the abundance of American farms, many nations have been spared from the specters of pestilence, famine, inflation, and submission to tyranny.

Now, Madam President, I am frankly worried—worried because of the efforts to drastically reduce our agricultural production.

Last March, this Congress, at the request of the President, authorized a program to sharply reduce the planting of corn and other feed grains this year.

According to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, dated June 21, 1961, 41.6 percent of the producers of corn and sorghum will reduce their planting over 20 million acres of corn and over 6½ million acres of sorghum.

The estimated cost of payments to farmers for making this reduction is $730 million.

This, with administrative costs, will represent an expense of about $800 million to the taxpayer.

To this amount, an additional sum of several hundred million dollars will be paid by dairymen, poultrymen, and livestock feeders as a result of higher feed prices.

This increase in cost to feeders has already started with an increase of 25 percent in the cost of barley in the past 10 days.

This increase in costs will, of course, be passed on to the housewife unless the loss is absorbed by the farmer and I doubt if that can be done.

How much the 1961 reduction program will actually lower production can only be estimated at this time, although the Secretary's report of June 21 states:

> The combined production of corn and grain sorghums will be substantially below estimated requirements.

Certainly, if the acres taken out of production are average producing acres the impact on our feed grain supply will be severe.

There are, however, other unknown quantities entering into the whole picture and upon which total production will depend, first, how much will nonparticipating farmers increase their acreage; second, how much will the yield of the planted acres be increased due to added fertilization and better care; and third, what effect will weather have on total production?

Without waiting to determine the effect of these three imponderables, however, the administration is insistently demanding a renewal of the feed grain reduction program.

Added to this demand is another demand which seeks a sharp reduction in the planting of wheat.

Besides these two specific demands, the administration has requested in the omnibus farm bill new and unprecedented authority for reducing the production of any and all other crops.

In seeking authority to make long-term commitments to foreign countries without the assurance that such commitments can be kept, the State Department is inviting greater distrust and possible failure in the international arena.

The agricultural productivity of the United States plays a double role in the drama of world affairs.

It proves to the people of all nations that a free agriculture is the most productive agriculture.

It assures the world that so long as American farmers are free to produce, our largess will be available to fight the scourges of hunger and inflation anywhere.

Before this Congress acquiesces any further in programs designed to curb food production, we had better take a long, hard look at where we really stand today.

How did we accumulate these so-called surpluses of grain that are supposed to burden us so much?

Do we actually have reserves greater than what is necessary to maintain our position in the world?

In the case of wheat, it was the result of the Korean war and the increased production incidental thereto that provided us with the generous supply we have on hand today.

A slim carryover of 250 million bushels in 1952 increased to 933 million bushels in 1954.

During the last 7 years this carryover has increased only 382 million bushels and this year it is not likely to increase at all.

Had it not been for the heavy accumulation of 1953 and 1954, we would have only a moderate, necessary carryover of wheat today.

In the meantime, the domestic use and export of wheat has increased un-

til, according to the records, there have been only 5 years in history when production has exceeded this year's total disappearance.

As it is, our carryover at the beginning of this marketing year is only a little more than the amount which was used domestically and for export during the marketing year just ended.

We have exported about 675 million bushels of wheat during the marketing year just ended. We have consumed in this country about 625 million bushels.

Is a year's supply of wheat an excessive amount to have on hand?

The carryover of feed grains has increased somewhat in spite of the fact that the annual domestic use and exports have increased over a billion bushels during the last 6 years.

In other words, we are using today for export and domestically more than a billion bushels a year more than we were using 6 years ago.

What has been overlooked, however, is the fact that we have been in a period of declining animal units.

In 3 of the last 6 marketing years, we have fed less than 162 million animal units.

This year, it is estimated we will feed 167.5 million units, with further increases required in the near future.

In view of our increasing population at the rate of 3 million a year, it is obvious that we have to concentrate on maintaining or even increasing our feed grain production through the 1960's—rather than getting upset because we now have a carryover of possibly 3 months more than a normal safe supply on hand.

A particular hazard in the administration's frequent use of the term "supply adjustment" lies in the fact that this term cannot be successfully applied to rainfall, temperature, sunshine, or grasshoppers.

For this reason, the companion term "production management" cannot be fully replete with meaning.

It was only 3 months ago that the Secretary of Agriculture embarked upon a grandiose and expensive program to reduce directly the supply of corn and grain sorghum and indirectly the supply of barley and oats.

On July 3, only 90 days later, the Associated Press carried this story:

WASHINGTON, July 3.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman imposed today limitations on sales of Government stocks of oats, barley, and corn. The aim is to conserve supplies to meet possible needs of drought-plagued livestock farmers in the northern Great Plains. * * *

The order also halts the release of Government oats and barley as payment for export subsidies on feed grain sold abroad and withdraws oats and barley from the export subsidy program.

Only 90 days after that program was started, to reduce the supply of all feed grains, it was found that we had already encountered a shortage in this country of oats and barley.

This order was issued at the very time that the Department of Agriculture is urging Congress to enact legislation requiring a compulsory reduction of 20 percent in the planting of barley next year.

The world is short of barley. The Canadian crop is failing. Nobody knows what our crop will be; and the demand is increasing.

Continuing reports from Canada indicate that drought conditions are severe in the western grain provinces.

Unless there is an unexpected change in weather condition it now appears that Canada will produce nowhere near enough grain this year to meet both domestic and export requirements.

Of course, we cannot tell yet just how serious the effect of the drought will be on final crop production in our Western States and Canada.

Nor do we know whether the drought will extend beyond this year or not.

We know that these drought cycles have started in small areas and have spread, until they have covered the greater part of the country. We know that a drought started in a small area in the Northwest 2 or 3 years ago and since then has been covering additional territory each year since, until now it covers parts or all of several of our great grain and beef-producing States.

We can be sure, however, that the combined production of wheat and feed grains in North America will be far less than our total needs and that our present comfortable reserve may disappear.

There is an ever-increased world demand for American food supplies.

In the Washington News of July 7, we find this item:

The Agriculture Department said today U.S. farm exports set new records in both value and volume in the fiscal year ended June 30.

Estimates by the Department set agricultural exports for 1960–61 at $4.9 billion.

This was 8 percent above the $4.52 billion in the preceding year and 4 percent larger than the previous record of $4.72 billion in 1956–57 when exports were stimulated by the Suez crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont an additional 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, farm commodities now account for 25 percent of our total export business.

Do we want to throw this $5 billion business overboard in the name of "supply adjustment"?

In the light of present uncertainties of production and the certainties of increased requirements at home and abroad, Congress would be shortsighted to authorize another short crop program for next year.

If the administration persists in its demand for less crop production, Congress simply cannot afford to authorize further commitments to supply food to foreign countries under long-term contracts.

Mr. President, I urge the administration to abandon its efforts to reduce the food supply of this Nation.

Food is a national defense item just as important to our security as ammunition, and tampering with the agricultural production of our country in these days of increasing international tension is a dangerous pastime.

Surely there are better ways to improve farm income than through the creation of scarcity and consequent high costs to consumers.

I want America to remain a land of plenty with freedom for our farmers to produce.

Through our bountiful food supply we have been able to save the people of many lands from hunger and distress.

Our food has enabled some nations to resist the type of government which is the very antithesis of freedom.

Because of our large reserve of food, U.S. delegates at the international bargaining table have been able to speak with conviction and from a position of strength.

American agriculture now furnishes employment for about one-third of our total working force. Do we want to reduce this opportunity?

The President of the United States ought to reconcile the conflict within his administration.

Does he support the Department of Agriculture in its effort to reduce the food production of the Nation, or does he support the State Department's proposal for increased aid including the furnishing of food to foreign nations?

Congress cannot legislate wisely or intelligently until we know which way the executive branch intends to go.

We have the right to know, and with important legislation coming before us soon we must know without delay.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield if I have sufficient time.

Mr. MORSE. It will not take me more than a minute to say that I join with my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Relations in the recommendation that the administration consider the food program in connection with the foreign aid programs. The Senator from Vermont and I know that the United States does not produce a single bushel of surplus grain which could not be put to beneficial use somewhere in the world in the great battle for economic freedom.

I think it is short-sighted policy that we do not set aside a part of the agricultural program and have it recognized and treated as the foreign aid agricultural program, as such. The agricultural surpluses thus produced could be used completely in connection with agricultural foreign aid. They could be kept separate and distinct from domestic agricultural production.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. There is no surplus of grain in the world today. There may conceivably be a shortage of grain, if the international tension continues or if the drought in the United States continues to spread.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on sounding the tocsin for us all. I also hope that the Senator from Vermont, in his work on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, will bring to us—because we have power right here, as measures are reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—his version of

what can best be done to fortify ourselves in the way he describes and by alternatives to relieve the plight of the farmer, because the present program seems only to reduce our capability to maintain our position in the world.

Mr. AIKEN. There are alternatives to the plight of the farmer. There are other and better ways to increase farm income. If I had plenty of time available, I should be glad to describe some of them. I shall do that at some future date.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Vermont will have every opportunity to do so in connection with the bill which will be reported by his own committee. I know the Senator will give us the benefit of his wisdom at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Farm conditions are deteriorating so fast that the situation may be drastically changed before the bill comes before the Senate for action upon it.

Madam President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding time to me.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I speak now to my amendment "D," and yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, this amendment makes certain modifications in subsection (e) (1) of section 104, which among other things consolidates the present authority granted by Public Law 584, Public Law 402, and Public Law 265, to provide for program grants to or for individuals directly or through public or private institutions. However, the subsection substantially broadens the existing authority to provide for the payment of expenses for dependents and members of the immediate family of grantees, beneficiaries, and participants under our educational and cultural exchange programs. Because of this significant change in the potential cost and scope of the program, I believe the matter deserves serious attention by the Senate.

This afternoon, I propose merely to call up the amendment and place it before the Senate. Perhaps overnight we shall be able to work out some arrangement in regard to it. If not, I propose to discuss it in full tomorrow and to have it voted on then.

My amendment would strike out the phrase, on page 11, in lines 23 and 24: "and, whenever it would further the purposes of this Act, for the dependent members of their immediate families".

If that phrase is retained and is enacted into law, we shall be specifically authorizing the payment of incidental expenses and travel expenses for dependents and members of the immediate family of any person participating in any of the educational or cultural exchange programs authorized under section 102 of this measure.

To demonstrate the breadth of this authority, let me point out that section 102 authorizes exchange programs running all the way from student educational exchanges to the exchange of teachers, technicians, performing artists, scientists, and athletes and athletic teams. Under the authority granted by subsection (e) (1) of section 104 of this bill, the administering agency could authorize the payment of travel expenses and incidental expenses for dependents and members of the immediate family of every member of the Bolshoi Ballet, or for the dependents and immediate members of the families of the Czechoslovakian track and field team, or for the dependents and immediate members of the families of the members of a touring baseball team from Japan.

It is quite unlikely that the Government will grant such an allowance, but once we give the Government that authority, demands for grants like that will pyramid upon the administrative officer, and immediately we set up the potentiality for creating ill will once we deny some dependency grants to people requesting them. Under unusual circumstances, we might, for example, think it is good to have members of the Bolshoi Ballet bring their wives, mothers, or sweethearts, but say we cannot go so far as to allow the expenses of wives of members of the Japanese baseball team. So we create ill will.

Under arrangements with the Appropriations Committee, and under the Comptroller General's letter, a program has been worked out which sharply circumscribes expenditures for dependents. It is against the open-door expansion of this procedure that my amendment would move.

I can appreciate that this new authority might be helpful in certain meritorious cases under the educational exchange program. For that reason, under conditions of amity between the Appropriations Committee and the administrative agencies, we have been doing that without specifically opening up rights and privileges under the law.

I further recognize that the authority to pay such expenses for dependents and members of the immediate family is a discretionary authority and is not required by subsection (e) (1) of section 104. But, because it is discretionary and because it will be used selectively, I can anticipate that it may create many more problems than it will solve. Under this discretionary authority, it is conceivable that we might agree, in processing an exchange grant for a French student, to pay the travel and incidental expenses for his wife and child. The day after such approval is granted, another French student, with a wife and six children, might make application, and in this situation it is conceivable that we would disapprove the payment of incidental and travel expenses for the wife and six children. It seems to me that this creates a situation where we may be charged with discrimination and arbitrary favoritism, and in this case it is my opinion that we will have done violence rather than benefit to the overall effectiveness of our educational exchange programs with foreign nations.

If we resolve the difference between the Frenchman with 1 wife and 1 child and the Frenchman with 1 wife and 6 children, the next day we may well have an application from a very distinguished scholar from an Arabian country who has 7 wives and 50 children. What are we going to tell him? Are we going to tell him he cannot come here after we have let the Frenchman in? How are we going to adjudicate it? We avoid those conflicts when we do not write into law specifically the right for those dependents to receive such allowances when persons are brought to our shores for educational exchange purposes or as other exchange visitors.

My amendment also would strike the words "or dependents of participants" which appear at lines 3 and 4, on page 12.

The purpose of this portion of the amendment is to assure that we will not be paying the emergency medical expenses, or the expenses for the transportation of a deceased person, in a case where the person for whom such expenses are paid is not an actual participant under one of our exchange programs.

Nor will we be paying the expense of travel, housing, and board while such a scholar or student is in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

The language as presently contained in the bill would allow or authorize the payment of such expenditures for dependents or participants and grantees under our educational and exchange programs. The arguments which I made concerning the first section of my amendment apply with equal persuasion in a case of this latter part of the amendment.

We pay the cost of some dependents of Americans who go overseas as students and professors. That is good. But it is the reverse procedure of bringing to our shores unlimited hosts of dependents which would result in vast additional expense to the Treasury that my amendment would operate against.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

As the Senator from South Dakota has indicated, under a ruling on existing law by the Comptroller General, the expenses of dependents may be paid. As a matter of fact, however, the Appropriations Committee has put limitations upon appropriations concerning the use of funds for dependents. Nevertheless, it remains flexible, and in certain cases it is possible to allow the expenses of dependents. This authority is particularly important in the case of senior professors. The policy of the administration in the past has been to allow expenses for dependents only in the case of senior professors and similar high-level people. I do not believe that any allowance for dependents of students has been allowed, either for Americans or foreigners, in recent years. There may have been some exceptions in the early days, particularly with regard to GI's, when their dependents were involved, and when we made very special efforts to be as generous as possible with them.

As Senators know, the law itself gives preference in selection to former GI's.

What is significant about the matter is that many of our professors, or at least a few of them, especially outstanding men, are requested by foreign missions. The senior members cannot afford to take their wives, and they could hardly be expected to go for a year without their wives. It is estimated by the administration that the average American professor on an exchange grant uses approximately $2,000 of his own funds to cover his family's expenses. If he has a grant to one of the more important countries, where the experience could be expected to contribute to his prestige and improve his earning capacity in the future, he may be willing to spend this money from his own funds for that purpose. Many of them have. But when some of the underdeveloped countries, who need the services of those specialists more than the advanced countries do, make requests for outstanding professors, and their experience in those countries will not in any way enhance their reputation or earning capacity or standing in their profession, those professors simply turn those requests down.

There have been many cases where American professors, and foreign professors for that matter, are unwilling or unable to make the large financial sacrifices. As is well known, professors are not wealthy, whether they are Americans or foreigners.

All the limitation would do is to take one step toward downgrading the quality of the teachers and professors who may serve under the program.

The purpose of the program, as I understand it, is to further our foreign policy and to obtain the best quality personnel we possibly can. In many cases it will be a great sacrifice for the individuals concerned, in the sense of enduring hardships and adjusting to foreign circumstances which, in many respects, are much more difficult for the older people, those who are professors, than for the students.

I think this restrictive amendment, which would delete the authority to allow the expenditure in limited cases, would be adverse to the quality of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Only a small number of dependents of American grantees have been permitted under the existing authority. I think last fiscal year was the first time it was specifically authorized by the Department of State. This related only to remote countries and to high-level people. It was never more than tourist class travel, and it was for a minimum of a 1-year stay.

The Comptroller General's decision in 1959 was largely based on title VIII of the Smith-Mundt Act. Because of section 1009 of that act, Public Law 402, the provisions in title VIII apply to all such international activities under the State Department's jurisdiction. The ruling was not restricted to the dependents of Americans.

I think it would be very unfortunate now to restrict the authority by deleting the provision. The fact that we deleted it, I think, would necessarily be interpreted, in the history of the legislation, as being a denial by the Congress of the authority which now exists under the ruling of the Comptroller General.

The cases which the Senator has supposed, about bringing men with 7 wives and 50 children to the United States, in my opinion do not lend themselves to very serious discussion. We have to assume a minimum of serious and intelligent administration of any act. Similar hypothetical illustrations of perfectly idiotic administration could be made, I suppose, for every bill considered by this body. The fact is that the authority has not been abused in the past. There have been very few dependents allowed. In many cases it is very important, for the quality of the program, to permit the sending of one or two dependents abroad with an American professor. This is not for the benefit of the dependents, but in order to promote the program itself; to supply the best possible available professors.

I think it would be equally important, when we wished to bring an outstanding man from abroad, to permit this. We would be prevented, otherwise, from bringing the man to the United States, simply because he could not bring his wife.

In many cases the wives of these people add a great deal to the impression made in the respective countries which they visit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Is the Senator from South Dakota prepared to allow the discussion to go over until tomorrow? If so, I shall request that the time for the proceedings from now on today not be charged against either side.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to speak for only 30 seconds.

Madam President, there is one big difference between having American professors take their dependents abroad and having foreign professors come to the United States with their dependents. As the law now operates, we pay with American money the expenses of dependents of American professors going abroad. That is an acceptable program as now operated.

We are now being asked, however, under the proposed legislation, to permit dependents of professors and others to come to this country and we are asked to pay for their expenses. If it were provided that the foreign country should pay for the expenses of dependents, as we pay for the expenses of the dependents of our people, that would be one thing, but we are asked to pay for the entire exchange both ways. Thus Uncle Sam's taxpayers pay all the costs, round trip, for everybody's traveling dependents. That opens up a Pandora's box which could come back to plague us.

I am perfectly willing to reserve the remainder of my time until tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the proceedings of the Senate from now on this afternoon not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1182. An act to create the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 1581. An act for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco;

H.R. 1614. An act for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis;

H.R. 2111. An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld;

H.R. 2145. An act for the relief of Joginder Singh Toor;

H.R. 2181. An act for the relief of Kim Dom Yong;

H.R. 2203. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pamela Gough Walker;

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.;

H.R. 3404. An act for the relief of Elemer Christian Sarkozy;

H.R. 4030. An act for the relief of Robert A. St. Onge;

H.R. 4360. An act for the relief of Hood County, Tex.;

H.R. 4369. An act for the relief of Henry James Taylor;

H.R. 4382. An act for the relief of Joseph L. Thomas;

H.R. 4528. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 4660. An act to authorize modification of the project Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts, with particular reference to the Kings Lake Drainage District, Missouri;

H.R. 5057. An act for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit;

H.R. 5143. An act to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901;

H.R. 5320. An act for the relief of Robert Knobbe;

H.R. 5321. An act for the relief of American President Lines, Ltd., Nitto Shosen Co., Ltd., and Koninklijke Java-China-Paketvaart Lijnen N.V. (Royal Interocean Lines);

H.R. 5518. An act to revise the boundaries of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5548. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $35,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway at Tennessee Ball or Beech Gap southwest and running into the State of Georgia;

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri;

H.R. 6122. An act for the relief of Maria Luisa Reis (nee) Loys;

H.R. 6514. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis Karel Dupre;

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam;

H.R. 6798. An act to amend the act incorporating the Washington Home for Foundlings and to define the powers of said corporation;

H.R. 6996. An act for the relief of Harry Weinstein;

H.R. 7042. An act to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7240. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Wupatki National Monument, Ariz., to provide access to certain ruins in the monument, to add certain federally owned lands to the monument, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7358. An act to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment;

H.R. 7391. An act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7581. An act for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac; and

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 1182. An act to create the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge; and

H.R. 7391. An act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 1581. An act for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco;

H.R. 1614. An act for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis;

H.R. 2111. An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld;

H.R. 2145. An act for the relief of Joginder Singh Toor;

H.R. 2181. An act for the relief of Kim Dom Yong;

H.R. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pamela Gough Walker;

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.;

H.R. 3404. An act for the relief of Elemer Christian Sarkozy;

H.R. 4030. An act for the relief of Robert A. St. Onge;

H.R. 4360. An act for the relief of Hood County, Tex.;

H.R. 4369. An act for the relief of Henry James Taylor;

H.R. 4382. An act for the relief of Joseph L. Thomas;

H.R. 4528. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 5057. An act for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit;

H.R. 5320. An act for the relief of Robert Knobbe;

H.R. 5321. An act for the relief of American President Lines, Ltd., Nitto Shosen Co., Ltd., and Koninklijke Java-China-Paketvaart Lijnen N.V. (Royal Interocean Lines);

H.R. 6103. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri;

H.R. 6122. An act for the relief of Maria Luisa Reis (nee) Loys;

H.R. 6514. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis Karel Dupre;

H.R. 6996. An act for the relief of Harry Weinstein;

H.R. 7358. An act to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment;

H.R. 7581. An act for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac; and

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2203. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain property in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 5518. An act to revise the boundaries of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5548. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $35,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway at Tennessee Bald or Beech Gap southwest and running into the State of Georgia;

H.R. 7042. An act to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7240. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Wupatki National Monument, Ariz., to provide access to certain ruins in the monument, to add certain federally owned lands to the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4660. An act to authorize modification of the project Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts, with particular reference to the Kings Lake Drainage District, Missouri; and

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5143. An act to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 6798. An act to amend the act incorporating the Washington Home for Foundlings and to define the powers of said corporation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BIRTHPLACE OF THE HYDROGEN BOMB

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I have always been pleased by the relationships between the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and the Livermore Radiation Laboratory, for they have been cordial and cooperative. Therefore, I was a little distressed when I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald for July 8, 1961, under the dateline "Yucca Flats, Nev., July 7," in an Associated Press story, this paragraph:

> The AEC refuses to comment about the neutron bomb, but there is speculation that research on the project is going on at the Commission's Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., birthplace of the hydrogen bomb.

I was not so distressed over the news story until I learned that the Albuquerque Tribune, in my hometown, under date of July 7 carried the same story with the same paragraph again referring to Livermore, Calif., as the birthplace of the hydrogen bomb.

Madam President, I wish to point out two or three things in connection with this.

The Livermore Radiation Laboratory was established in July of 1952. At that time the Mike design, the forerunner of the hydrogen bomb, was firmly established and was under construction at the Los Alamos Laboratory. The device itself, the first hydrogen bomb, was detonated at Eniwetok in November 1952. It could hardly have been possible that Livermore Radiation Laboratory was the birthplace of a bomb which was under construction before the Laboratory was established and which was exploded so soon thereafter.

As a matter of fact, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy became very much interested in the question of whether or not this country should develop what was called the "super." It was not referred to, in the early days, as the "hydrogen bomb" at all. Always, in discussing it, there was a question of whether, having finished one bomb which had a destructive capacity comparable to some 20,000 tons of TNT, this country should build a "super," which would use lighter materials and could be exploded with much greater power.

During the years from 1943 on—in fact, during 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948—work proceeded on the so-called super bomb. If we needed a confirmation of that fact, during the Oppenheimer hearings, the following testimony of the Director of the Los Alamos Laboratory was given under oath. Dr. Norris Bradbury made the following statement:

> There was active research, investigation, and exploration in this field (lighter elements for weapons) during the war years. There was actually a system, essentially thermonuclear in nature, devised shortly after the war in 1946–47 for which techniques were then not possible or appropriate to bring to fruition.

Also later on in the testimony he said:

> The progress of the laboratory during the years following the war in understanding and development, and indeed, some systems of very close relevance to the thermonuclear

system as we know them today, were an essential part of the ultimate actual ability to make an effective thermonuclear weapon.

Even "the Hydrogen Bomb," the Blair and Shepley book, says:

Both AEC weapons laboratories were fully mobilized for the job. There was ample work for both, and the scientists at both did their utmost. Los Alamos made the greater contribution.

I point out that even that book, which many times I have said was a little slanted in some of its viewpoints, concedes that Los Alamos made the greater contribution, and it would be hardly fair and proper to refer to Livermore as the birthplace of the hydrogen bomb.

In fact, 92 percent of all hydrogen bombs that are in our stockpile are Los Alamos bombs. The Mike shot was being manufactured when Livermore was started. Until 2 or 3 years ago every subsequent device that we produced was a Los Alamos device in the field of the hydrogen bomb.

The exact date of the first Los Alamos Laboratory weapons actually to enter the stockpile shortly after the Mike shot, is probably classified, but the laboratories wasted as little time as possible in getting actual usable weapons into being. The time was actually very short indeed.

The first Livermore thermonuclear weapon to enter the stockpile, and the first weapon of any sort, did not enter the stockpile until 4 years after the first Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory entry, and therefore quite a number of years after their first being established the practical use of the thermonuclear principle by Los Alamos.

I have said previously, and I wish to repeat, that I believe that the laboratory at Livermore has done very fine work. It has had some exceptionally fine people connected with it, including Dr. Teller, Dr. York, and Dr. Brown, all of whom have had other governmental responsibilities, and now Dr. Foster.

I believe it is unfortunate when newspapers make the statement with reference to Livermore, knowing the facts as they must know that Los Alamos was the first into the subject field.

Finally I would like to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a citation from the White House signed on July 8, 1954, from the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, as the Nation's principal institution for the development of atomic weapons, has continued to discharge its responsibilities to the people of the United States with highest distinction and by its achievements has rendered invaluable service to the Nation and the free world.

The Laboratory's momentous success in the field of fission weapons has been followed by equal accomplishments in the fusion field. These achievements are the result of a remarkable group endeavor and the devoted and skillful effort of the individuals of the staff of the Laboratory.

In recognition of the outstanding achievements of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and their contribution to the welfare and collective security of this Nation and the free world, this citation is awarded to the Laboratory as a means of expressing to all its members the gratitude of the people of the United States of America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JULY 8, 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I believe it is unfortunate that we find in newspaper stories statements of the nature to which I have referred. Such stories try to make it appear that the Livermore Laboratory, splendid as its work has been, was the real birthplace of the hydrogen bomb. Actually the patent, which I believe has been granted, though it may be only pending, on the hydrogen bomb bears the names of the two scientists, Dr. Stan Ulam of the Los Alamos Laboratory, and the other Dr. Edward Teller, who had been at the Los Alamos Laboratory, but who moved to Livermore. Those are the two men who have been properly given credit for the bomb. I am happy that the Los Alamos Laboratory had a great part in the accomplishment.

RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, for over 16 years the Federal Communications Commission has had before it what is known as the clear channel proceeding—docket No. 6741. On June 13 the Federal Communications Commission announced that it was directing the preparation of an order which would permit the duplication of 13 of the existing 25 clear channel stations. In other words, the Commission would allow a new station to be established on the same frequency as those now held by 13 of the present 25 clear channel stations. The final order has not yet been published.

Madam President, I am very proud of the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Newton Minow. He is, of course, from Illinois. But more important than that, he has brought to the Commission a sense of public service and public duty which has been all too rare there in the past. He has taken the position—and a quite proper position—that basically the airwaves belong to the people and that they are held in trust for the people by those stations which are granted licenses by the FCC.

In a courageous speech he gave here to the broadcasters, Mr. Minow pointed out what we all know to be the truth—that there is a "vast wasteland" in the programing of radio and television. He has correctly taken the point of view that these valuable licenses carry with them the responsibility for those who receive them to serve the public interest.

Madam President, I not only have no criticism of Mr. Minow, but I have the greatest admiration for the way in which he has carried out his appointed tasks in the face of groups with very great economic and political power which seek to preserve their existing power.

Furthermore, with respect to the clear channel proceeding, a decision has been long overdue, for this proceeding was started more than 16 years ago and has been left unfinished until very recently.

In announcing its instructions for the preparation of a order, however, the Commission has duplicated 13 clear channel stations while leaving some 12 clear channel stations unaffected. Among the 13 clear channel stations which are to be duplicated, 6 are network stations, 3 more are owned by a single firm—Westinghouse—and 2 others are to be duplicated for what appears to be rather special reasons. The remaining two are independent stations.

In effect, what the Commission has ordered is that the network stations and those which are owned by one firm, plus four independent stations, two of them with special circumstances, be duplicated. What it has also done in general is not to duplicate the remaining independent stations. In this area, too, there are two network stations which are not affected but on which other stations will, in fact, be allowed to broadcast.

Madam President, I do not have enough knowledge of all the circumstances to make a judgment as to the correctness and initial fairness of this decision. But I can make a judgment about my own State.

In the case of Illinois, every clear channel station serving our State, namely four stations in Chicago and one station in St. Louis, is to be duplicated. This will leave Chicago and Illinois without a single clear channel station.

The proposed purpose of this order is to provide more service to what are called the white or underserved areas of the country. These areas are those which are not served by a nighttime ground wave and the people in these areas are essentially without adequate nighttime service.

I am not at all certain that from the way in which the stations are to be duplicated that any large proportion of the 25 million people now without adequate nighttime service will, in fact, receive that service. This at least is questionable.

But what is clear to me is that in my own State, the effect of the decision will be to increase the area and the number of people who will be without adequate nighttime service. I think it is fair to say that the effect of this decision with respect to the clear channel stations which serve my State will be to deny more people adequate nighttime service than the new "duplicate" stations will serve. If that is the case, and I believe this to be true, I wonder if the decision by the Commission will, in fact, achieve its purpose? And I want to say here that I agree with the basic purpose of attempting to provide adequate service to the underserved or "white" areas of the country.

It would also seem to be clear from an analysis of the proposed order that the network stations are basically to be duplicated under this order while the independent stations, as a group, are not to be duplicated, at least at this time.

In the case of the Illinois area, it appears that the Commission decided to duplicate the four network stations; namely, WMAQ, WBBM, and WLS in Chicago, and KMOX in St. Louis, and

having decided to do this, determined that WGN in Chicago, which is an independent station, had also to be duplicated even though independent stations as a group were not to be duplicated.

Therefore, the effect of the decision will be to leave Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Missouri without a single clear channel station. The closest clear channel stations will be in Des Moines, Iowa; Minneapolis, Minn.; Louisville, Ky.; and Cincinnati, Ohio; and, of course, these will not adequately serve Illinois.

As I say, I am not well enough informed to make a judgment about this proposed order in its overall effects, but I can say that I think Chicago and the Illinois area should not lose at one fell swoop all five of the clear channel stations which serve them. I think this is especially true when one examines the list of those clear channel stations which are unaffected and notes that, by and large, they are left in areas with a good many fewer people than in the Chicago and Illinois region. This is emphasized by the fact that the 12 unaffected stations are almost all in areas of much smaller population, except for two New York stations. And while these two New York stations are unaffected, both of them already have, or will have, other stations on their frequencies.

I hope that before this order becomes permanent the Commission may reconsider the effect of the order on Chicago and Illinois which is the second largest population area in the country but which will have no clear channel stations at all if this order goes into effect. This is true even though only one-half of the clear channel stations in the country are to be duplicated.

Now let me turn to the situation existing in my own city of Chicago. Three of the four clear channel stations there are network stations. The fourth is an independent station which is owned by the Chicago Tribune. I think it is fair to say that the Chicago Tribune has never been a great supporter of the senior Senator from Illinois—either before or after he was elected to the Senate. In fact they have fought me in season and out for a third of a century. Therefore, when I say that this independent station which is owned by the Chicago Tribune has been scrupulously fair and has probably performed as great a public service both in the field of public affairs and special features, such as its farm programs reaching into the more rural areas of the State, as any station in the country, I believe that no one will accuse me of bias or prejudice in favor of this station. I can truthfully say that WGN has been most scrupulous in dividing time equally between and among political parties and groups in Illinois, in covering news events of groups with which its owners probably violently disagree, and in giving time to public interest and public service broadcasts which is really unrivaled in most areas of the country. From an examination of the data I have seen which the FCC has put out in directing the preparation of its order, it would appear to be that the only reason that WGN was duplicated was that the Commission decided to duplicate the other Chicago stations, for otherwise most of the independent stations were unaffected.

May I also say that I believe the CBS station in Chicago, namely, WBBM, has also made a real effort to serve the public interest with its news, public affairs, and programing in general. All this is said without derogation to any of the other clear channel stations.

I would hope that before the FCC order becomes final the situation which as it now appears will prevail in the Chicago and Illinois area if the order goes into effect will be reconsidered and that Chicago and Illinois will not lose every single clear channel station which now serves it.

THE NEED FOR TECHNOLOGICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, in discussing a far-reaching report recently issued by the National Science Foundation, Dr. Richard Bolt, associate director of the science foundation, emphasized this portion of the report:

> Every young person who shows the desire and the capacity to become a scientist should be ensured the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Howard Simons of the Washington Post staff wrote the following lead on his story concerning the National Science Foundation Report:

> During the next decade the American people must at least double everything—dollars, facilities, and manpower—connected with science and engineering education and basic research if the United States is to maintain itself as a first-class scientific nation.

Madam President, one of the proposals now before the Congress which could go a long way in helping to meet this need is S. 349, the cold war veterans GI education bill. Patterned after the highly successful education programs under the World War II and Korean conflict GI bills, the cold war GI bill would extend educational opportunities to more than 4 million young Americans. The previous GI bills gave the Nation 450,000 engineers, 150,000 physicists, chemists, and other scientists, 180,000 doctors, nurses, and medical technicians, and 230,000 teachers. The cold war GI bill would also open opportunities for the education and training of hundreds of thousands of needed scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and technicians over the next few years.

Madam President, I recently placed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post, showing that Communist Russia this year will graduate three times as many technological personnel from its colleges and universities, including chemists, physicists, and engineers, as we are graduating this year from American universities and colleges; also showing that Communist Russia this year is graduating more than 200,000 technicians, while we in America are graduating only 16,000 technicians.

The only program which will in great measure take up this lag is the cold war GI bill. I have the privilege of serving on the Veterans Subcommittee and also on the Education Subcommittee, and I have studied all these bills. I am coauthor of most of them. All of the college education bills combined will not place the students in engineering and science colleges that the GI bill alone will place there.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the aforementioned article by Mr. Simons from the July 10, 1961, issue of the Washington Post entitled "Double Aim on Science, United States Urged"; also an editorial on the same subject from the July 11, 1961, issue of the Washington Post entitled "Twice as Many Scientists."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1961]

DOUBLE AIM ON SCIENCE, UNITED STATES URGED—MOVE NECESSARY TO KEEP IN LEAD, NATION IS WARNED

(By Howard Simons)

During the next decade the American people must at least double everything—dollars, facilities, and manpower—connected with science and engineering education and basic research if the United States is to maintain itself as a first-class scientific Nation.

This is the implication of a far-reaching report issued here yesterday by the National Science Foundation.

The total cost during the next 10 years for the United States to insure its scientific program will be an investment of more than $50 billion.

The report suggests that this is a minimum investment, which if not made, could very well mean that scientific progress in the United States will level off and possibly stagnate.

Though an exact year-for-year breakdown of investment and manpower needs is not made, a cost is given for 1970—$8.2 billion. This is $5.2 billion more than the investment being made in fiscal year 1961 from all sources to colleges and universities for science and engineering education and for basic research.

At a press briefing, Dr. Richard Bolt, NSF's associate director for research and the man chiefly responsible for the report, suggested that a goodly portion of the additional investment will have to come from the Federal Government.

The major goal, and hence the reason for this investment, Dr. Bolt emphasized, is contained within the report itself. It is: "Every young person who shows the desire and the capacity to become a scientist should be insured the opportunity to do so."

The report has already been widely promulgated to members of the administration, including President Kennedy, Congressmen, scientists, and educators.

President Kennedy, in a letter of comment to NSF Director Alan T. Waterman, said, "the report makes clear that the Nation has a major challenge to realize to the fullest the potential of those young people who are expected to show desire and capacity to become scientists in the next decade." Achieving this goal, the President said, "will require the sustained efforts of all those in the Nation who are concerned with the quality * * * of American science and technology."

The report, lists as "musts" the following national investments in science and engineering education during the decade from 1961 to 1970:

From 100,000 (1961) to 175,000 (1970) in professional staff at colleges and universities.

From $800 million (1961) to $2,100 million (1970) in salaries for this staff.

From $150 million (1961) to $350 million (1970) in facilities for this staff.

From a total expenditure of $2.1 billion (1961) for science and engineering education to a total expenditure of $5.5 billion (1970).

INVESTMENTS IN COLLEGES

In addition, the report states, the national investment in basic research in colleges and universities during the decade ahead must increase:

From 45,000 (1961) to 85,000 (1970) in professional research scientists.

From $345 million (1961) to $970 million (1970) in salaries for these scientists.

From $85 million (1961) to $360 million (1970) in facilities for this staff.

From a total expenditure of $0.9 billion (1961) for basic research to an expenditure of about $2.7 billion (1970).

PREPARE OTHER PLANS

This is the first of a series of reports developing each of the "musts" set forward in this overall estimate of needs for the decade. It is for this reason that the report does not detail many of the schemes being prepared by Dr. Bolt's staff to show how and where and how much future investments must be made.

Absent from the report is any mention of competition with other nations and the pressures of such competition that might compel the Nation to invest heavily in its scientific progress. The reason for this, Dr. Bolt made clear, is that with or without competition from other nations the United States would still have to maintain its own progress if it is to conquer "disease and ignorance."

The issue, he said, is not competition with another, but the challenge of "how can we obtain the maximum strength from our own efforts to give us a solid scientific foundation to insure the Nation's well-being. If the United States wants to achieve this goal, Dr. Bolt said, the report tells the Nation how much it will cost.

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 1961]

TWICE AS MANY SCIENTISTS

In these days of cold war the annual investment in science is usually related to our national security. That relationship is very real and intimate; yet it is only one of various reasons for the growing demands for science education. Increased scientific knowledge may also mean better health, longer life, more abundant production. It is the well spring from which many of the changes in our rapidly evolving civilization flow.

A major policy document released by the National Science Foundation notes that a century ago machines supplied about 1 horsepower for each worker. Today they provide about 10 horsepower per worker. Eight out of ten workers were then required to feed the Nation; now less than 1 out of 10 is ample. The gist of the message which the Foundation has to offer is that in this day of accelerated scientific discovery the United States must step up its contributions to basic research and scientific education in order to keep in the forefront of social and economic progress. The Foundation sees no dearth of human talent for this purpose. Science and engineering doctorates, the report says, "have risen from about 400 in 1920 to 6,000 in 1960 and can be expected to reach about 13,000 in 1970." Nor do the authors of this study see any danger of draining too much of the Nation's top talent into the science and engineering fields. "The projected doubling of science and engineering doctorates by 1970," they conclude, "would still leave a wide margin of capacity available for the Nation's many other needs—for intellectual leadership in all professions."

It is the financing of this larger investment in science which creates the major problem. Colleges and universities already have a deficit of about $300 million in science teaching equipment and they will need an additional $200 million annually for the next 10 years to meet growing demands. The need for science laboratory buildings, research equipment, professional staff, and other items is also acute. The NSF calls for a step up in the total expenditure for science and engineering education from $2.1 billion in 1961 to $5.5 billion by 1970, and for an increase from $0.9 billion to $2.7 billion for basic research.

This may seem to be a high price, but we surmise that it will have to be met to avoid a slipping backward in the age of science and technology. The NSF points out that high quality in scientific education is especially important for the United States since it cannot possible compete in numbers with other more populous and rapidly growing countries. Given the kind of world we live in, we cannot afford to lag in this vital particular.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I have listened to the interesting statistics the Senator has given with reference to technicians being graduated from schools in the Soviet Union as compared with technicians being graduated from our schools. I believe it would be much more meaningful in the RECORD if the Senator would add the source of his information.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The source is the article from the Washington Post which I placed in the RECORD, in its entirety, within the past 2 weeks. It was printed in the paper on page D–20, the business page of the paper. The information comes from the Engineers Council of the United States.

Sometimes figures on Russia given by the school people have been criticized; but these figures have been provided by the professional engineers of the United States, who have called on the American people to educate more technicians, more engineers, more scientific personnel, if the United States is to overcome the technological lag.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Is not this information in conformity with the information we generally get from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, it is. The Department has been giving similar warnings, but some people have been criticizing the Department for empire building, stating that the Department simply wants to build up more personnel and build more schools. It is very interesting to observe that the figures I have just given concerning the number of technicians, scientists, engineers, chemists, and physicists, which Soviet Russia is graduating come from a professional engineering group in this country who are themselves in society. They are asking, we might say, for more competition by having more people trained in some professions in which we are lagging behind Russia.

This warning is in conformity with the warning given by Admiral Rickover, the developer of the Polaris submarine. He has stated that he believes the Russian educational program poses a greater threat to us than her missile advance and rocketry advance.

Also, we have had a warning by Dr. Teller, the inventor of the H-bomb, who says that if the United States does not act to increase the number of engineering and scientific personnel, we will be behind Russia in 10 years.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Texas upon the fine work he is doing in the area of advanced education. I have cosponsored with him proposed legislation of this type in the past, and I hope we may continue to do so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his kind remarks. His continued support of the cold war education bill since 1959, when it was passed by the Senate by a vote of 53 to 31, is welcomed. I am glad to report to the Senator from Michigan that the record of the hearings we have had this year will come from the printer this week—at least, I hope we will receive it this week—and that we shall then be able to move in the subcommittee and the full committee.

I also commend the Senator from Michigan for his leadership in the field of education. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He is in attendance at the sessions and works on education bills with a devotion which gives me great pride.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

NEW JERSEY TELEVISION CHANNEL 13

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, considerable debate is taking place in the New York area about the utilization of channel 13, the WNTA–TV channel, which emanates from Newark, N.J., but covers the whole metropolitan area, and is now proposed to be taken over by a citizens' group, which contemplates that it shall be essentially an educational television station.

This proposal is opposed by the Governor of New Jersey, who has written to me, and I suppose to others, as follows:

If New Jersey channel 13 is made available to an educational group interested in locating the headquarters of operation in New York City, New Jersey would be the only State, territory, or possession to be denied full utilization of this important communication medium for community interest needs.

The Governor's letter is dated July 7, 1961.

The New York Times of today, July 11, 1961, has published an editorial entitled "TV Knows No Boundaries." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV KNOWS NO BOUNDARIES

The opposition of Gov. Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey to the establishment of an educational television station on channel 13 should not deter the Federal Communications Commission from the earliest possible approval of the metropolitan area's newest cultural outlet.

The Governor's obstructionist attitude can only be construed as a disservice to the

public interest, convenience, and necessity. In his extended brief filed with the FCC, he has adopted the position that unless New Jersey gets the TV outlet on his terms (he concedes he is not in a position to put them into practice), he will stand in the way of others ready and qualified to operate the channel in the broadest public interest.

The Governor asserts he wants New Jersey matters to be more fully represented on the air. Yet he scorns Educational Television for the Metropolitan Area, Inc., the prospective new operator of channel 13, which promises to do just that. He contends that commercial TV has neglected his State in favor of catering to a mass metropolitan audience. But he opposes the one group that, thanks to its immunity to the pressures of the marketplace, will be in a position to cater to specialized needs in prime evening time.

The sincerity of Governor Meyner in championing the New Jersey cause need not be questioned. But the realization of his aim will not come about through an isolationist policy separating his State from the larger community. His goal can be achieved if New Jersey accepts a full partnership in this unique undertaking.

The Governor's time-consuming strategy, including a court fight, could have the effect of wrecking the educational TV venture; there is a deadline on the educational group's option to purchase WNTA–TV. It would be in the public interest—specifically including the New Jersey public—for Mr. Meyner to withdraw his protest.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I call attention to the following paragraph of the editorial:

The sincerity of Governor Meyner in championing the New Jersey cause need not be questioned.

I certainly do not question it, although I thoroughly disagree with the Governor.

But the realization of his aim will not come about through an isolationist policy separating his State from the larger community. His goal can be achieved if New Jersey accepts a full partnership in this unique undertaking.

It is on that point to which I wish to address my remarks as a Senator from New York. We are very proud of the metropolitan area of New York, which is a tristate area. It is an area which includes a very large population; the most populous part of the State of New Jersey, the great city of New York and its environs, and a very large population in Fairfield County, Connecticut, as well.

It seems to me that great pride ought to be taken by each of the component States of this metropolitan area in its enormous population, its outstanding achievements, and the fact that it is, in many ways, not only the center of commerce, finance, and many educational and cultural activities, but also that it is the seat of the United Nations.

As one of New York's own Senators I may say that this area is considered by us not as New York's province, either in the sense of the city or the State, but as the property and the heritage of the whole area. Many of us, including myself, have supported the work of the Port of New York Authority and other bistate and tristate agencies. We want to continue to do that, whether it relates to water supply or the port or transportation facilities, or to commutation facilities, because this is the way of the future.

The way of the future means that we are a whole country, and that even if there are State lines, we will not let them interfere with what we have accomplished in the interest of the people of an area. If it is necessary to jump over State lines, that may be done by interstate compacts or by other arrangements which can be made for that purpose.

So we would really not wish in any way to enter into a controversy about this matter. Certainly education does not prosper in terms of controversy. Yet I express the hope that the Governor of New Jersey will carefully consider the position, which I believe is quite objective, of a great newspaper like the New York Times, and determine in good conscience whether the tremendous service for educational purposes of such a great television channel as channel 13 would not represent, in a sense, a blessing which the State of New Jersey should facilitate for the whole metropolitan area, taking great pride in the fact that it is making that great contribution, and in the fact that this great public benefit emanates from Newark, in the State of New Jersey.

Especially is this true because, as I know, and the Times says so, the group which is concerned has given its assurance that the programing will give the utmost consideration to the State of New Jersey in terms of local activities, local endeavors, local ideas and aspirations, and the capabilities which the State itself might produce for placing programs on this channel.

I hope we may have this excellent offer, to which I have just referred, pursued in the whole metropolitan area, and that rather than any feeling that New Jersey would be denied, as the Governor of New Jersey puts it, "full utilization of this important communication medium for community interest needs," the Governor and the people of New Jersey may feel that here is a great opportunity in which they can gain the greatest satisfaction by making possible so broad a public service as would this channel devoted to educational purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 11, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 139. An act for the relief of Krste Angeloff;

S. 442. An act for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris);

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes;

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 576. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis;

S. 1720. An act to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world; and

S. 1931. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF FORMER SENATOR GEORGE WILLIAM NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Today, the 11th day of July 1961, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of George William Norris, a Senator from Nebraska.

Earlier today ceremonies were held on the steps of the east front of the Capitol connected with the dedication of the George W. Norris commemorative postage stamp. Among the speakers were the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States.

Presentations of special stamp albums were made to various Members of Congress and to representatives of the President. Also, a special stamp program was presented to Mrs. Jerome Doolittle, granddaughter of the late Senator Norris.

Also, festivities and a celebration are being held today in McCook, Nebr., where the widow of the late Senator is still living. This evening a banquet will be held in that city to commemorate this anniversary. It is regretted by both my colleague and myself that because of senatorial duties here, we were not able to attend the festivities and celebration there.

Madam President, on May 15 the Senate approved Senate Resolution 146. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 146), adopted by the Senate on May 15, 1961, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the late George W. Norris served for ten years as a Member of the House of Representatives and for thirty years as a Member of the United States Senate with dedication, distinction, and untiring concern for the public welfare; and

Whereas he served with distinction as chairman of two standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas he sponsored progressive reforms through such proposals as the 20th amendment to the Constitution, anti-injunction legislation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Act, and the unicameral amendment to the Nebraska State Constitution; and

Whereas he was beloved by his own State of Nebraska and the Nation as a whole for his courage, integrity, and unselfish devotion to the cause of his fellow man; and

Whereas July 11, 1961, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That at the conclusion of that day's business, or if the Senate is not in session on that date, then on the next following day on which it will be in session, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 146, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late former Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 11, 1961:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John B. Duncan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1964. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 11, 1961:

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Warren D. Quenstedt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Legislation in the Field of World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a few days ago our distinguished colleague from the State of New York, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, was the keynote speaker at an American Management Association conference in New York City on expansion of U.S. exports.

Because of his long experience in this field, and his recognized leadership in shaping legislation to help expand our world trade, I am requesting that his thoughtful remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, we who are serving on the Senate Small Business Committee have been working closely with Senator JAVITS on the important legislation, which he discusses. Bills to strengthen the services of the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, and the Export-Import Bank are now pending before our committees.

For this reason, it seems to me that the challenging views of Senator JAVITS are helpful in our consideration of legislation pending on this problem.

All of us are committed to expanding U.S. exports; we are indebted to Senator JAVITS in suggesting practical ways in which the Federal Government can help.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Senator JAVITS' speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JACOB K. JAVITS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very much.

Gentlemen, I am glad to be with you this morning.

I thank you, Mr. Hood, for introducing me so promptly because I have what in Washington are called floor problems. I have to get right back to Washington because we have a social security bill on the Senate floor.

Gentlemen, I am deeply concerned with this subject because I believe that, interestingly for businessmen, you stand at the crossroads of something that can be of inestimable value to our country as well as to your businesses. I think it is essential for American business to move actively and aggressively into the export field.

I think it is also essential to our Nation to materially expand export trade now, with all that that implies. This not only goes for us, but it also goes for our allies, with whom we must have a great deal to do on this subject.

I would like, first, to congratulate the American Management Association, whose elaborate plant here I never saw, though this is my hometown, on staging this kind of briefing session at this time for this particular purpose, because I think it is a rare opportunity and is rarely as felicitous as it is right now.

You have heard about our discussions on the floor of the Senate and Congress generally on foreign aid. These will be succeeded, I assure you, by discussions on foreign trade. The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act comes up for renewal next year. It will face a terrific fight, and yet it is essential to our country.

The reason it will face a fight is that exports imply imports, and imports hurt people; at least some think they do, and, hence, you have political pressures developing to eliminate imports in one line or another because they hurt a particular local-interest industry or a particular local community. And, yet, if you eliminate imports of one kind or another, you lessen the capability of other nations to accept your exports, and you invite retaliation, and, what is even worse, you invite retaliation by the Soviet bloc, which is a very serious threat in this whole field.

Now I am not without knowledge in this field. I am not only a Senator but I am also chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO parliamentarians. This is my third year, and, so, on a number of occasions in every year I have gotten a thorough education on what happens in trade all over the world. In addition, I serve on the Senate Small Business Committee, on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and on the Joint Economic Committee, and I have dealt with this subject all my life. I used to be chairman of the Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

I say that to you because I hope you will not dismiss what I say as just being the recitation of a few facts that somebody wrote down for me and let it go at that. I assure you that what I tell you is not based upon any such superficial approach.

Now, I believe it absolutely essential to our Nation that we double our exports in the next 10 years from $20 billion a year to $40 billion a year. Now, we doubled our exports between 1950 and 1960. So we showed that it can be done. They went from $10 billion to $20 billion. Some of that was price inflation, but a good deal of it was actual increase in goods.

Between 1959 and 1960 our exports to the six-member nations of the European Economic Community increased by more than $1 billion, going up an enormous percentage rate, verging on close to 50 percent. The significance of that is that it shows what can be done when you begin to get integrated markets. And when people begin to rationalize the problems created by their own boundaries—and let us not forget, and I heard what Mr. Hood said about timing—let us not forget that you are having the beginning of that in the Americas. There are now two Common Market areas which are developing, one in Central America and one in South America, and I think the time to look into them is now and not when they are actually formed and organized as the European countries have organized under their own treaty.

Now why is it essential that we get into the export field in a much bigger way? I will give my reasons for that because I found that businessmen derive great satisfaction in feeling that what they are doing, in quite a selfish business sense, is nonetheless in the very deep interest of the United States.

I notice the gentleman here from one of the banks. Probably there are a few other bank people here. Well, I know the banks very well, and I talk with their people many, many times, and the concept of business in the public interest is a very strong one among banks and bankers, who more and more feel themselves interested. So I lay certain considerations in the public domain before you this morning as an inducing cause for doubly hard work, doubly intelligent work, and redoubled interest on your part, because your interest should be not only business but patriotism.

The first reason is that we are facing terrific competition from the Communists. They are moving especially into the less developed areas. Between 1954 and 1959 the Soviet bloc increased their trade with the

less developed areas by 165 percent from $860 million to $2.3 billion in roughly 6 years. And they expect even greater gains for 1960 although final statistics are not yet available.

In that 6-year period the ratio of U.S. trade over the Soviet bloc with these same nations was reduced from 9 to 1—that is, we did, as compared with the Soviets, nine times as much trade with these 41 less developed nations—to a ratio of 4 to 1. And the Soviet bloc is primed to draw these countries into economic dependence.

The Soviet bloc has tremendous potentials in this area. It has tremendous potentials for economic warfare. It has already caused us considerable trouble in a few commodities—flax, tin, bauxite, and now residual fuel oil. Almost at will it can seriously disrupt free world markets by dumping material at a cut price.

Now this is a very serious danger and just indicates that the Soviets can and will play an increasing role in world trade.

When Khrushchev said "I will bury you," he meant I will bury you economically, and he confidently believes he can do this just because of this power. Hence, this is one of the main reasons why more and more we have to be dedicated to the world as well as to our own country in terms of trade.

Second, we face a serious imbalance in our international payments. Just last year we were losing at the rate of $3.5 billion to $4 billion a year. Even we can't stand that. Hence we had to reverse the trend.

Now the policies of the Government and business did reverse the trend very materially, and we now have an easily manageable basic deficit of less than a billion dollars a year as the difference between our outgo and income in terms of dollars. But it is generally believed that this relative stability is temporary, and the reason it is believed it is temporary is that our export surplus is not big enough to make it permanent. Our export surplus range in the area of $5 billion is now very heavily attributable to jet aircraft and cotton, and these are considered special situations. So everybody can expect—and anybody who read the First National City Bank newsletter the other day—not to place you in competition—saw that they confidently anticipated that we will have a balance-of-payments crisis again in the fall of this year.

The only way that can be dealt with on any permanent basis is by a material increase in our exports, and let us remember that the world hungers for American products. If we had the salesmanship and the credit medium—and I will come to that in a minute—by which to get them out, the world is starving for the very things we make, providing we can get them on the proper credit terms and we can sell them and put them to use in all these countries.

It is unbelievable that the U.S. steel production should be at a 70 percent rate in a world which is thirsting for the very steel which is not being produced and which absolutely needs it, if it is to stay free and not go Communist.

So point No. 2 is the serious imbalance in our international payments. Point 3 is the lessening effect of foreign trade on economic recessions in the United States. It has been demonstrated time and again that foreign trade often holds up at a time when we have a domestic recession, and this is an extremely valuable anchor to windward especially where you are dealing, as I say, with a world which is so starved for the very things we make. And I am not going to bemuse you again with all the detailed points. You know them very well.

The question is, For how long can we extend credit, and will the free world as a whole follow through in the less developed areas until these areas do come through based on their development plans, because based on the facts that they have people and resources, they are bound to come through ultimately if we persevere enough. Even the British say with their crazy "ground nut" scheme, about which many of you know, in which they dropped a neat $160 million or $170 million, that if they had been able to go through with it, if they had the capital and were willing to go through with it, it would have been successful notwithstanding the fact that it was very fanciful and had a lot of "bugs" in it. But even they say in a scheme like that, "if we had only been able to go through with it, it would have been successful."

That indicates what I say, that most of these places are credit worthy if you were sure there would be followthrough in terms of government and individual investment until they could actually mature on their development plan.

Now I believe these things for these three above reasons at least, and there are many others in terms of the fact that the domestic market doesn't have a saturation point but that the exigencies of international affairs are such that there must be ultimately some ceiling on the development of the American standard of living in terms of our own defense needs, in terms of the toughness of our own people, and in terms therefore of the development and expansion of industry, the great opportunities abroad. And I think there is a very interesting sidelight on that in the enthusiasm with which our young people have embraced the Peace Corps. There is something instinctive about the fact that the young American boy and girl wants this adventure which the West used to give and which the world now gives, and whether we like it or not this will put us out in the world and will put business out in the world. So, in emphasizing the export trade for business, small and large—and I will come to small business in a minute—you are riding with a stream, you are riding with the current of our times.

Now what do we need to do in order to double our export trade in the next 10 years?

First, we must be prepared to take our share of imports. This is absolutely indispensable. The dollar may go all over the world, but sometime it has got to come back here, and the same is true of what we export and what we get paid for. Those people have got to find their money coming back to them somehow, sometime, somewhere, and the only way that that can be done is ultimately if we take our fair share of imports just as we develop our export trade.

Second, we must open up export opportunities to smaller U.S. business. This is the big area, and it still remains to be explored. There is a most infinitesimal participation by American small business in export trade, and in my opinion there you come right up to the point of credit and you have just got to be for the export guarantee operations of the Export-Import Bank so that they give a complete program both of political and commercial risks of export credit guarantees which in the first instance represent an underwriting after the credit has been taken by a bank or insurance company. But this is absolutely a very, very grave problem and in very grave need particularly on the part of small business.

The Small Business Administration, I think, is quite ready to help with this particular situation. That has been the nature of the testimony which we have had from them. But essentially this is a matter for the Export-Import Bank.

In other countries, notably in Britain and in West Germany, in France, Italy, and Japan, there is a tremendous program for both small and large business in the underwriting of export credits, and I will say to you gentlemen who are interested in the export trade that I have yet to see a real liveliness on the part of our banks and insurance companies in this regard.

Now our banks do pretty well although not as well as I think they ought to do, but at least I don't think they are nearly as much subject to criticism as are the insurance companies because here are tremendous pools of capital which are very, very useful for the purposes that we are discussing, and, when backed with Government guarantees, would have absolute security and yet make available to the business community tremendous new resources in terms of export trade.

There are other suggestions aside from the straight Export-Import Bank underwriting very much like an FHA underwriting of a mortgage for export credit. For example, one I would like to lay before you is one proposed to us by Francis X. Scafuro, vice president of the Bank of America International, of New York, who has been cooperating with the international section of the New York Board of Trade. His proposals are incorporated in two bills in the House, of which you may make a note if you like—Federal charter with the right to borrow Federal funds to make good on its guarantees, guarantee corporation to be established by H.R. 7102 and 7103, one of Mr. MULTER, of New York and the other by Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

He proposes an American export credit but functioning on a premium basis with the efficiency and the independence of a private corporation.

Some 109 export organizations back this bill, and it deserves, I think, the serious consideration of the Congress, if the Export-Import Bank doesn't come up with a program, although it has a draft program out and indeed has been conferring with some of our New York banks about it.

But the question is of consummation. We must have a very comprehensive program of export credit guarantees.

I might say to you, too, that another legislator, who has been rather active in this field and deserves a good deal of credit, is Senator ENGLE, of California, who is a colleague of mine on the Senate Small Business Committee, and is also on the Senate Commerce Committee. He has been very active in this field.

So small business essentially needs the Export-Import Bank backing in terms of guarantees, and needs new pools of capital, that is, of available funds which will back it up in terms of credit extension in its exporting trade.

Also we had some testimony here in New York which indicated that there are a good many companies starting up which give a comprehensive service to small business and take over all of its problems of export sales in terms of documentation, credit, packaging, advice, selling, designing, advertising, and so forth.

Now these package deals may and may not be too expensive. I just don't know. But, in any case, the testimony before the Small Business Committee of the Senate is available to any of you who wish it, and gives a considerable detailing of those services. If you want a copy of that testimony, write my office and we will be glad to let you have it.

Now the third thing which we have got to do in terms of our activities to increase exports is to enlist the cooperation of Western Europe. This is an enormous opportunity.

In the first place, as some of you may know, I am launching quite a campaign to get the OECD, the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, to back up our Alliance for Progress and to double it. I think the Alliance for Progress is just about half enough. That is the $1 billion to $2 billion a year which Latin America needs. It ought to be $2 billion to $4 billion a year in order to really do the job that needs to be done. And the Europeans can very well manage it. But beyond that there are some things they have to do themselves. For example, you know all trade is not just bilateral. It is multilateral, quadrilateral, quintilateral, and you can go on as far as you like from there.

One of the big bugs which we find now is that the European countries, by a lot of taxes called sumptuary taxes, of which I will be glad to give you a list if you are that interested, keep out some of the very important commodities sold by Latin America, notably coffee and cocoa. They also keep out a good deal of tea.

We have estimated, for example, in our office, that as regards one tax, the sumptuary tax on coffee alone in only a few countries, to wit, Germany, France, Italy, if you didn't eliminate it but just reduced it to make it reasonable in relationship to a tax revenue purpose, and took away its penalty features which are now imposed by these three countries—kind of the remains from the past when they had no dollars and were in very difficult financial situations—and you would enable Latin America to sell $60 million to $100 million more of coffee every year to just these three countries alone. These are called sumptuary taxes, kind of an internal excise tax, sort of a sales tax, if you will.

I mention that only because it is an indication of what we can do to help ourselves, and a very striking indication of how we in the Western World are tying our own hands and making it tougher for ourselves to deal with these major problems.

I myself have introduced two major measures to expand our exports and to deal with the problems created by our imports. One is called the National Export Policy Act, S. 851, and the other is the National Import Policy Act, S. 852.

In the National Export Policy Act I had the cooperation of every member of the Senate Small Business Committee. The bill, Senate 1379, is sponsored by 19 Senators, popularly known as the Sparkman-Javits bill. Senator SPARKMAN has done me the great honor of joining with me. He is the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

This measure establishes a Council on Export Promotion in our Government, and proposes to augment very materially the export services, including advertising and the use of other media of that character, rendered both by the State Department and the Department of Commerce. It proposes to expand enormously our trade centers and trade missions. It proposes to run pilot projects which will be especially helpful to small business in respect of warehousing and market research in fields abroad. And, of course, it proposes to beef up tremendously our financial means for accelerating the export drive.

This is a very important measure. It has an excellent chance for passage. It has rather impressive backing and can be of tremendous aid, especially to small business, and has enlisted the whole Senate Small Business Committee.

On the import side—and again I emphasize to you as exporters the critical importance of a proper and fair climate for imports into the United States—it seems to us in Washington, who think as I do, that there is no other way than adjustment assistance. Now, what adjustment assistance means, in effect, is that you take the communities or the line of business or even the individual business and certainly the worker who is put at a disadvantage by imports, and you try to do something for him, not by cutting down the imports or eliminating them, although that must stand on an economic bottom if it is a major and serious injury to American business.

As you know, we have the escape clause, the peril point provisions with respect to negotiations, with the power of the Tariff Commission and the President in those regards, but when you get into a situation where imports are desirable in terms of either the Nation or your world trade position, but they nevertheless hurt people, you have got to find some way of helping those people rather than eliminating the imports.

There we think that loans, tax incentives in terms of remachining or retooling or going into another line of business are very important to the businesses themselves, and, with Senator CASE of New Jersey, I have actually introduced such legislation to do these things.

Also for the worker, we propose supplementary unemployment compensation which I might tell you has an excellent chance for passage. This is a very burning issue, as is early retirement for those who are 60 or over under the social security law, and relocation assistance if the worker wishes to move from place to place and vocational retraining assistance which may very well find its way into the vocational educational bill which we are now considering.

That, I think, gives you a fairly rounded picture of what we are doing in Washington in the efforts to accelerate this strong posture by our country in terms of foreign aid, and perhaps will suggest some ideas to you as to how you may fit into it.

Many good men have come up with many ideas, as I mentioned to you; for example, Mr. Scafuro's idea and others which have been presented to us, those ideas I have myself espoused, not original with me, either, but discussed and put forth by many distinguished economists who appeared before us in the Joint Economic Committee. I think a good many of these will be enacted into law. Some may be delayed until the later session of Congress. Some will run afoul of the rivalries in Government agencies, or perhaps be the victims of timidity in industry and reluctance to blaze new trails. But I do think there will be a supporting and helpful body of legislation, and I would urge you in figuring your own export plans to include the idea that the Federal Government will help with the general export picture either in the ways that I have explained or in other ways.

I might also point out that if any of you have any ideas, let us have them, because, after all, this is where they can be made merchandisable where I work, and this is where we can do something about them, and I assure you of our deep and burning interest. And I think I can assure anybody who has had any experience with me or my office that we don't toss any idea out. We examine it and do our utmost to find some way in which we can use all the ideas we get.

The issue before us is really how best can the peoples of the world satisfy their hunger for the world's goods and services. If the answer is through the private economic system, then the private economic system has got to rise to the enormous challenge which the world poses to it. It needs to send its goods to Malaya, to Senegal, to Brazil, to Iraq, and to Nigeria with the same efficiency and same security with which it supplies eager millions in New York or any other city in the United States. And I must say in conclusion that I am very impressed with the fact that an organization like this, which is so seriously engaged in this work, would get you gentlemen together in order to endeavor to give you an education in this field.

I would also like to point out to you—and I hope very much that you will take this away with you—I think it is very important in terms of Government that, much as you like to think of politicians as fellows who run after the next vote or are worrying about the next election or maneuvering for whatever will be their own personal position—I have served in the Congress of the United States now for 8 years, and in the Senate for 5 years. That gives me a total of 13 years of legislative service. And I would tell you, gentlemen, that in the main—not that it is not by any means unanimous, but in the main, the men and women who are serving in the House of Representatives and the Senate are just as dedicated as you are to the purposes and the aspirations for which you sent them there. There are a lot of good brains and a lot of good information and a lot of very smart people down there trying to do the Nation's business.

If any of you have ever testified before a Senate or House committee, I think you will go away a lot more respectful of what we know about our subjects than when you got there.

Also, we are deeply interested in what the American business community proposes to do about the export business and the import business. We know better than anybody else that even with a $5 billion aid bill you don't begin to scratch the surface of what can be done for this world when you figure that foreign trade is $135 billion a year. And all the aid we give Brazil, for example, can be swept down the sewer in one afternoon if there is a drastic fall in the price of coffee, and you can duplicate that in every country in Latin America, in Africa, and the Middle East. In other words, we are no fools either. We understand what we can and what we cannot do. And I will tell you, gentlemen, freedom will not win unless the business community of the United States learns its part in how to operate in respect of our policy all over the world. And if it does, and learns it well, then the victory of freedom is unquestionable. We will pulverize Mr. Khrushchev once we learn how to use our resources effectively.

Our economy is not less than 2½ times his; maybe 3 times. We have a vaunted reputation in the world of knowing how to supply the very things everybody wants. The only point is that they don't trust us to do it as yet, and here is where the American private economic system is very important.

So, while I come up here on a very hard trip—I left Washington this morning and I must go back at once—I assure you that I don't do it because I want to hear myself talk or because you are such nice fellows. I do it because this is a burning question in the public interest and you can, standing where you do, be materially helpful to the future of our country and to the future of freedom. I hope very much that as you go into these things in your day-to-day problems, you will add an additional quotient of adventure and the willingness to take some risk. You can make the analogy with what

other men and women have risked in war, and I assure that this is just as much of a war as anything we have ever fought.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Thomas C. Egan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a grieved heart for, just a few days ago, a truly great friend and college classmate was laid to rest.

The death of Thomas C. Egan, a U.S. district judge, early Thursday came as a shock to his fine family and the great multitude of friends that he acquired in his 67 years on this earth.

Tom was stricken Wednesday afternoon as he was about to leave the bench in a courtroom at the Federal Building in Philadelphia. He died 13 hours later in St. Mary's Hospital.

I first came to know Tom as a student at Georgetown University where both of us became close personal friends.

He never forgot his university and he served it well, as he did all other organizations who were blessed with his membership. He was named alumnus of the year by Georgetown University in 1953. He was a past president of the University's Alumni Association. Five years ago, Georgetown University gave Tom Egan an honorary doctorate.

A veteran of World War I, Tom went into politics shortly after he received his law degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1921. He was active in independent Republican politics on both a State and national level for a quarter of a century.

Former President Eisenhower appointed Tom to the Federal district court 4 years ago and he served with distinction.

I loved Tom for many reasons. One of the big reasons I loved him was that he was a humanitarian in the deepest sense of the word. Most recently, he was chairman of the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission and headed its fund drive. In 1954, he received the Humanitarian Award of the Deborah Tuberculosis Sanatorium and Hospital for his achievements and contributions in civic and humanitarian affairs.

Another reason why Tom was loved and admired was that he was first, above everything else, a devoted family man. Almost all of his time away from his office was spent with his lovely wife, Mary Kelly Donnelly, and his three sons, Thomas C., Jr., Charles, and Paul, and his daughter, Sister St. Ursula, a teaching nun with the Order of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

How proud he was of his family, and how proud he was that his daughter had decided on living a life of the religious.

Truly, Tom Egan must be with the saints in heaven today. For, there was no finer man walking this earth who lived every moment as a true disciple of his God.

A Tribute to Volunteer Fire Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 in the friendly village of Mamaroneck, N.Y., there was executed a parade of firemen from the surrounding villages and countryside which was so extraordinary that I believe the story of it deserves being perpetuated in the RECORD.

There have been such parades in Mamaroneck for years, featuring the volunteer companies in or near my constituency, and they have always attracted a sizable crowd. The occasion to which I have referred, however, established a precedent not only in the number of spectators who viewed it, which approximated 15,000 and the number of companies which marched in line, but also in the evident morale of the firemen themselves whose performance was marked by precision and vigor and whose equipment fairly sparkled in the bright lights of the evening.

Someday, someone will tell the story of the contribution which volunteer firemen are making to the communities of Westchester County as well as to other communities of the Nation.

The willingness of the members of the various departments to spring forth on a moment's notice in the service of their communities is a tribute to the firemen and to their fine sense of the fitness of things.

Only recently in Eastchester, N.Y., eight firemen were severely injured in fighting a serious blaze. Instances without number could be mentioned wherein these courageous volunteers have risked their very lives for their fellow citizens.

There are other aspects to the volunteer fire department which constitute a saga of village life which is often overlooked. Their high sense of responsibility to their officers and to their communities is coupled with a warm sense of friendship which makes their meeting places wholesome and pleasant surroundings in which to enjoy the comradeship of rugged men.

Their high sense of purpose is commendable and at the parades such as I mentioned above, people from the villages and towns all over the county rejoice not only at the demonstration but at the opportunity to pay tribute to the men they respect so highly.

My own community of Mamaroneck which staged the parade under the able guidance of Walter Webber, Jr., owes much to the fine group of men who over the years have constituted its fire contingent. In any emergency in which the village finds itself, the volunteers can be counted on to respond immediately in the best interests of the 17,000 people who make up the population of the village.

From the days when men drew their own trucks by hand to modern times when a firetruck costs anywhere from $25,000 to $50,000, volunteer fire departments have taken pride in maintaining their equipment in first-class order and in conducting themselves as first-class members of the community.

I take this opportunity to commend not only the firemen in my own community but those in other villages and towns who are rendering service willingly and without thought of gain. They are the salt of the earth, and Mamaroneck and other communities are proud of them.

Pensions for World War I Veterans, Widows, and Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony which I have presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs supporting legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 6199 and H.R. 6200, which would provide a pension for veterans of World War I with certain income limitations and a pension for widows and widows with dependent children, also with certain income limitations. It is my sincere conviction that these legislative proposals should receive the serious consideration of the Congress at this time. My testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of presenting to the distinguished membership of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs this statement in support of my bills, H.R. 6199 and H.R. 6200. In deference to your busy schedule I will be brief. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to be commended for scheduling hearings on pension legislation affecting the some 2½ million World War I veterans still living, and also those surviving widows and children of such veterans who find it financially difficult to provide the daily needs for themselves.

H.R. 6199 which pertains to survivors of veterans of World War I would amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a monthly pension of $65 for the widows of World War I veterans subject to an annual income limitation of $2,000 for widows without children and $2,400 for widows with children. This would modify the present pension program of existing law for widows of World War I veterans so that the program would be a separate and permanent pension act. Under my bill in order to be eligible the widow of the World War I vet-

eran would be required to have been married to the veteran for a period of 5 years or more and for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage. The restrictions imposed on income would be the same as those under the pension law that expired June 30, 1960.

I am sure you will agree with me that it is reasonable to assume that the employment opportunities for the widows of these veterans have been greatly lessened due to their ages. Taking these factors into consideration it can hardly be expected that their average annual incomes would exceed $2,000. It is also reasonable to assume that minor children would, with the advance of time, become a decreasing factor in benefit cost and eventually the widows without children would be the sole beneficiaries of my proposed bill.

H.R. 6200 pertains to the veterans of World War I themselves and would amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a monthly pension of $100 for World War I veterans subject to an annual income limitation of $2,400 for single veterans and $3,600 for veterans with dependents. All honorably discharged veterans of World War I who served in active wartime service for a period of 90 days or more, or honorably discharged after having served less than 90 days for a service-connected disability which is recognized by the Veterans' Administration, shall, upon reaching 62 years of age when there is a disability existing of not less than 10 percent and there is reasonable medical evidence to substantiate that such a disability will continue throughout the remainder of the veteran's lifetime, be entitled to a monthly pension of $100 a month. If the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance the monthly rate would be increased by $70.

Under the provisions of H.R. 6200 a veteran's income would include social security and retirement pay, less the veteran's contributions; the veteran's share of jointly owned stocks and bonds, saving bank deposits, and the dividends or interest accruing thereon; and other such personal income.

The veterans of World War I and their widows deserve the small pension increases proposed in H.R. 6199 and H.R. 6200. It is my belief that we can make this pension program more adequate for those who need the help most if these pensions are based on some proven need, and not granted to all regardless of income or abilty to provide for themselves.

For those veterans who were on the pension rolls before July 1960, from 1946 to that time their pension only increased from $60 to $66.15 monthly for a veteran under 65 and from $72 to $78.75 for a veteran over 65. In the same period widows' pensions only increased from $42 to $50.40 monthly. I am sure that I need not recite to the members of this committee what has happened to the purchasing power of the dollar in a similar period. I might add at this point, that I have received numerous complaints concerning the determination of a veteran's eligibility under the present law.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things about my bill, H.R. 6200, that is not included in other bills pending before your committee is that the benefit eligibility is related to benefit need and would not be available to veterans fortunate enough to have income over amounts prescribed in the bill. This in my judgment is an equitable and appropriate modification. The suggestion for its inclusion was presented to me from members of one of the outstanding veterans organizations in my district. It is a meritorious proposal in that it tailors the Federal program to answering actual need of a significant number of our veterans who have served their Nation in time of war and who now must necessarily look to their Government for help in their declining years.

Let me conclude my statement by commenting briefly on the budgetary aspect. I recognize that what I proposed will result in the expenditure of additional Federal funds in behalf of the veterans of World War I. The exact expenditure involved will be furnished to the committee by actuaries and experts of the Veterans' Administration. It is my conviction that caring for the veterans of our Nation who need financial help is more appropriately a function of the Federal Government than are some of the proposed Federal expenditures that are now being provided by State and local programs. Therefore, I believe that in terms of establishing a priority for the application of Federal funds a very high priority should be given to this deserving and urgent need and that we must meet the cost of the program by delaying some of the suggested Federal programs that encroach upon State and local prerogatives and traditional functions.

I request that your committee give favorable consideration to these legislative proposals.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Appeal by the President for Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a public statement unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the Citizens' Committee for International Development, announced at the White House, Washington, D.C., on July 10, 1961; also an article entitled "Transcript of President's Appeal for Aid Program," published in the New York Times of July 11, 1961.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC STATEMENT UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ANNOUNCED AT THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 10, 1961

Our purpose in meeting with the President today was to give him our personal pledge and tell him of our conviction that the American people do accept the challenge to carry out to the fullest measure of their ability the responsibilities imposed on our citizenry in this critical decade.

Specifically, we informed the President of this committee's abiding confidence that the United States must maintain an effective program for economic and social development, as well as military aid, to other less developed nations which are seeking to develop the well-being of their peoples in peace and freedom, and to advance their security. We believe that the security of this country, as well as the peace of the world, depend on a comprehensive efficiently operated foreign aid program—a program of a size and scope consonant with our responsibilities as the leader in the 1960's of the free peoples of the world.

To this end, the Citizens' Committee endorses the program for international development which has been submitted to Congress by the present administration as the most effective program that can be devised within the context of sound economic policy.

It is our belief that the reasons which impelled our Nation to establish a program permitting other free nations to share our progress and maintain their strength, in freedom, are even more compelling now than in the days of our earlier foreign aid operations—in the days of the Marshall plan, point 4, mutual assistance, and ICA.

The challenge to the free world, political, military, and economic, sharply increases week by week, even day by day. The totalitarian forces of the world are themselves expanding their own programs of aid and sending thousands of trained technicians, along with other forms of exploitation.

Any withdrawal or reduction of the efforts of the United States in this field would be an abandonment of our responsibility, a demonstration of unconcern for the weal of freemen, and an immeasurably dangerous threat to our own security and democratic way of life.

This committee points with pride to the notable successes of past programs through which we have assisted in the rebirth of a free and strong Europe, in the development of less privileged nations into societies that can with realism look forward to economic and political stability.

Our attention must now be focused on maintaining these successes and achieving new gains. We must focus not on weakness in the administration of foreign aid programs of the past. These weaknesses can be substantially mitigated by the determination to do so, expressed by the President, and by the steps now being taken to improve both overall administration and personnel selection by the new agency proposed under the President's plan and reflected in the current legislation. These moves, combined with the proposed planning of foreign aid on a country-to-country basis, will go far toward correction of the causes for criticism in the past.

We agree with the President that the annual appropriation machinery, through which foreign aid has been made possible in the past, seriously impairs the effectiveness of our development efforts. Our agreement stems from our own experiences in our private activities—business, labor, and community management. Accordingly, we support a modernized, business-type approach to foreign aid, pointing toward long-term development programs and the elimination of ineffective commitments to meet annual fiscal year deadlines. This can be achieved without sacrificing the safeguards of the annual review of the operations of the program by the Congress. We are sure that the long-term authority, under the new legislation, will permit more economic and effective planning with a maximum degree of self-help and sustained reform commitments on the part of the recipient nations.

This committee notes the fact that, at present, a major part of all foreign aid is spent in the United States for materials and services and that the percentage of funds spent in this country is expected to reach 80 percent. We commend this objective as minimizing the outflow of dollars under the program, with its salutary effect on our balance of payments—as well as directly providing substantial employment in the United States.

We believe that the program for international development and the legislation currently before the Congress is sound in aim and purpose. There is no effective alternative to this program. Whether we maintain our position and leadership in this area or not, those who would destroy freedom throughout the world will continue their programs. We can ill afford, either out of our own economic and security interests, or equally important out of our concern for the peoples in the developing nations of the world, to leave a vacuum to be filled unhindered by the forces of mass aggression and destruction of individual rights and freedom.

We invite—yes, we urge—all Americans of whatever political affiliation to join us in support of this program. We urge every citizen to recognize and accept his obligation to assure that this generation of Americans will have successfully carried out its responsibilities to our heritage, to our way of life, and to our freedom-loving friends throughout the world.

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT'S APPEAL FOR AID PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Following is the transcript, as released by the White House, of President Kennedy's remarks to the Citizens Committee for International Development today:

"I want to express my thanks to you, and to the other members of the committee who are outstanding public and private citizens, for their effort to assist us in securing the passage of the mutual security bill through this session of the Congress.

"I consider this bill to be probably the most vital piece of legislation in the national interest that may be before the Congress this year. It involves the effort by this country for its own security, for its own well-being, to assist other countries in maintaining their security.

"All of us have been concerned, rightfully, when one or another country passes behind the Iron Curtain. I can say, as my predecessor, President Eisenhower, said before me, that if the United States were not engaged in this program, if we fail to meet our responsibilities in this area this year and in the days to come, the years to come, then other countries must inevitably fall.

"The Communists are making a great effort to expand their influence, to move their center of power outward. The thing that stands between them and their objective are these governments and these people.

"I believe that we have an opportunity to assist them to maintain their countries' independence. They depend in a large degree upon us. This country is a free country. It has great resources, and I think we have to recognize that freedom for ourselves and for others is not purchased lightly. It requires an effort by each of us. This is a matter of the greatest national importance. It is a matter which has engaged the attention of the United States since the end of the Second World War. We have seen the assistance which we gave to Western Europe permit Western Europe to be rebuilt into a strong and vital area upon which our security depends. We see ourselves heavily engaged in Latin America. We see ourselves involved in a great effort in Africa, in Asia to maintain the independence of these countries.

"It is not an easy matter for our people to again support this kind of assistance abroad, but I want to make it very clear that it is assistance to the United States itself. We cannot live in an isolated world. And I would much rather give our assistance in this way—and a large part of it consists of food, defense support as well as long-term economic loans—I would much rather have us do it this way than to have to send American boys to have to do it.

"We believe in this program. One of the most important parts of it now is the provision providing long-term authorizations and commitments. That means that we will say to a country that if you will do "one, two, three" on taxes and land reform and capital investment, then the United States, along with other prosperous countries of Western Europe, will be prepared to meet their responsibilities over a longer period.

"Now, when we move from year to year, without having any idea what we can do in the future, the country's programing, the country's organization for its advance, is bound to be haphazard. And I think that is one of the reasons why the program has not always been successful in the past and one of the reasons why we have had waste in the past.

"We are bringing new people into this organization. We are reorganizing it. We are getting the best talent we can get. I hope that we are going to get long-term authorizations to permit us to move ahead over a period of time.

"I want to express my thanks to you, Mr. Pierson, for your efforts, and to the members of your committee. You are now engaged in a most important public service. And I want to ask the American people to support this program as a vital one in the fight for our own security and in the fight for peace."

Lake Garnett Grand Prix Sports Car Road Races

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, I had the very fine opportunity, indeed it was a real pleasure and privilege, to participate in the festivities relating to the Third Annual Lake Garnett Grand Prix Sports Car Races.

Mr. Don Stith, president of the Lake Garnett Grand Prix Sports Car Racing Association, invited me to deliver a few remarks at the opening ceremony on July 2, and to have the honor of presenting the Queen of the Races, Miss Carole Harmon, a student at William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., with a bouquet of roses. Being a sports car racing fan, and one already familiar with the great event at Garnett, I was delighted to be able to accept Mr. Stith's invitation.

But, Mr. Speaker, my greatest delight was to observe the races, and to see once again how wonderfully well the civic clubs and associations of Garnett, along with hundreds of individuals from Garnett and Anderson County, have cooperated to make this tremendous and spectacular event possible.

Don Stith, whom I have already mentioned, the officers of the association, Frank Bennett, R. W. Farris, Arthur Hughes, Leonard McCalla, Jr., and Kenneth Crippin, and Race Chairman Ted Brown deserve particular commendation for the dedicated effort they have shown in making the Lake Garnett Grand Prix the most notable sports car races in the Midwest, and equal to those throughout the rest of the United States and Europe.

Another factor, besides the hard and good work of the men just mentioned and all of those who have anything to do with the races, which makes the Grand Prix the outstanding event that it is, is the fine quality of the race course. It is a true road course, a very rare course, and one that is acclaimed the world over.

I must repeat how delighted I was to be able to attend the Grand Prix—it was really invigorating. I take this opportunity to invite my colleagues to attend it next year and see for themselves what a thrilling experience sports car races are.

Salvatore Embarrato—I Have But One Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the residents of New York City and especially those of the Lower East Side of Manhattan were saddened on July 6, 1961, at the news of the untimely death of New York State Trooper Salvatore Embarrato in the line of duty. It seems that in pursuing a speeding car on the New York State Thruway, Trooper Salvatore Embarrato went off an embankment and was instantly killed. His death is a statistic, but does not tell the story of the man. While in this instance a law violator in speeding caused the death of Trooper Embarrato, others may have indirectly contributed to his early end.

The untimely passing of this young man brought me great sorrow and heartache. I felt a personal responsibility for this young man, who fervently desired to serve his community and his State in the enforcement of the law. When disaster such as this strikes, one has certain misgivings in the quest for justice. Sometimes it may end in death. The path of glory leads but to the grave.

Safer employment and less risky occupations were open to Trooper Embarrato, but his drive, ambition and energy called him to law enforcement, with its attendant dangers. The story of this young man is a story of an American boy who believed in equality and who refused to be denied the right to be treated as an American.

In 1953 Salvatore Embarrato at the age of 22 passed the civil service examination for police officer in New York City. He ranked No. 82 out of 1,330 applicants on the written examination. He was

found qualified and was certified for appointment by the Civil Service Commission, but rejected by Police Commissioner Frank Adams because the young man's father was a fugitive from justice.

Salvatore Embarrato was class president and class valedictorian during his senior year at St. Joseph's Parochial School. He successfully completed the required State regents and entrance examination to Cardinal Hayes High School from which he graduated and matriculated into Fordham College where he pursued a premedical course. He was required to leave college during his junior year to help support his family.

In November 1951, he applied for pilot training in the aviation cadet training program and in February 1952 he was found qualified for navigator training. He has been a member of the auxiliary police, the ground observer corps, and was a regular contributor of blood to the Armed Forces through the American Red Cross.

After leaving school, he was gainfully employed in various positions, such as, in the U.S. Post Office and New York City Department of Finance. His coworkers and fellow citizens recommended him highly.

In 1954 a proceeding was commenced in the Supreme Court of New York State to review the action of the police department in refusing to appoint Mr. Embarrato as a police officer. The court at that time stated that while the refusal to appoint Mr. Embarrato because of the peccadilloes of the parent was against natural justice, it sustained the action of the police commissioner on the ground that the court could not review the discretion of the police commissioner. The case was appealed by me to the appellate division of the supreme court. Pending the appeal, Mr. Embarrato took the police examination once again and passed it with flying colors. While awaiting determination as to an appointment after passing this second examination, Mr. Embarrato was inducted into the Armed Forces and served honorably doing classified work, and holding down positions of responsibility. He was proficient in the training of canines and was honorably discharged in December of 1956.

Being a determined man, Mr. Embarrato took and once again passed the police examination. After various legal processes, a trial of the issues as to the justification of the police commissioner in refusing this young man appointment to the police force of the city of New York was ordered. On March 3, 1958, the case finally came to trial before a justice of the supreme court, Thomas Dickens. After hearing the facts in the case and the testimony, Justice Thomas Dickens recommended that the matter be referred once again to the police commissioner for reconsideration without regard to the element of the young man's ancestry. The police commissioner thereupon reconsidered and called Mr. Embarrato to appear for appointment on March 5, 1958.

Now the O'Henry twist. Mr. Embarrato, after removing the blot from his good name and proving his right to be treated as an American without the visitation of the sins of his father upon him declined appointment to the police department of the city of New York and joined the New York State Troopers.

He had been a State Trooper of the State of New York since March of 1958, and gained recognition for daring exploits and extraordinary police work. A little more than 3 years after joining the enforcement branch of the State of New York, Salvatore Embarrato was killed seeking to apprehend a violator of law.

I share with the members of the family the grief which is theirs. The wails of the mother at his bier still ring in my ears. The family can be proud of this young man who proved that he was an American, who fought for the right to be treated as one. He was a devoted and loving son. The memory of his good deeds and wonderful performance will forever endure in the hearts and minds of his friends, his mother and father, and his family. Like our heroes of yesteryear, Trooper Salvatore Embarrato had but one life to give to his country.

H.R. 3903, a Bill To Provide a Pension for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this date I appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in support of my bill, H.R. 3903, designed to provide a pension for veterans of World War I.

My bill, H.R. 3903, is one of many similar measures pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and reveals the widespread interest in providing a pension for the veteran of World War I.

My statement before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs follows:

Mr. Chairman, the privilege of appearing in support of my bill, H.R. 3903, is appreciated. I would like to commend the committee for scheduling hearings on pension legislation because it is the means of providing a ray of hope to the 2½ million World War I veterans still living out of the 4,744,000 Americans who served their country in 1917 and 1918.

As many of you know, my interest in veterans' affairs has been long and continuous. It began in the 1920's when I served the Department of Pennsylvania of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for 2 consecutive years as department commander. In the mid-1930's it was my honor to serve three terms as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Since then I have continued my VFW activities in many capacities.

Upon my election to the 76th Congress, I became a member of this committee and served on it for several years until my resignation from Congress to enter active military service during World War II.

The purpose of reciting this background information is to inform you that my advocacy of a pension for the veterans of World War I started in my Veterans of Foreign Wars days and continued during my congressional career by the introduction in each Congress of a World War I pension bill. My support of this type of pension legislation is based on the traditional American principle adopted following the Revolutionary War and adhered to up to and including the Spanish-American War.

This principle was stated in 1931 by former President Herbert Hoover when he said in part: "the principle that this Nation should give generous care to those veterans who are ill, disabled, in need or in distress, even though these disabilities do not arise from the war, has been fully accepted by the Nation."

The trend in the last few years has been to depart from this traditional principle and is further emphasized by a movement started several years ago to have social security absorb veterans' benefits.

At this time, I should like to commend this committee for the action taken recently in adopting a resolution opposing the transfer of the veterans' vocational rehabilitation program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This proposal is one of several steps already taken by the Government toward the eventual absorption of various veterans' programs. I want to add my support to this committee for the leadership it is giving in resisting assaults on veterans' programs.

Returning to the World War I pension question, the average age of the 2½ million surviving veterans of World War I is now more than 66 years and according to reports of the Veterans' Administration, they are dying at the rate of 100,000 a year. As the average age increases, it must be accepted that the annual death rate will mount. In other words, if the traditional treatment accorded our veteran population of previous wars is to be given to the Veterans of World War I, action must be taken immediately.

It is on behalf of the veterans of World War I and especially the many barracks of Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., in my congressional district that I appeal to this committee for consideration of my bill, H.R. 3903, or any of the many similar bills that have the same objectives.

My bill, H.R. 3903, amends title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and if enacted into law would be known as the World War I Pension Act of 1961.

In plain words, the intent of the bill would increase by 30 percent the present non-service-connected monthly benefit of $78.75. If my arithmetic is correct the monthly benefit would be increased to a little over $102. Ninety days of service and an honorable discharge are required. In addition, the present schedules of income limitations would be increased for single persons to $2,400 and to $3,600 for those married or with dependents.

There is also the provision that when considering income to determine eligibility such income will be exclusive of social security benefits, railroad retirement benefits, annuities, or other pensions.

Mr. Chairman, you are going to have many witnesses appear before you on behalf of the subject of a pension for the veteran of World War I.

In asking for favorable consideration I would like to mention that from an economic standpoint approval of a pension of slightly over $100 for veterans of World War

I who meet the income limitations gives assurance that pension money will be channeled into the economic stream of the Nation.

It will be spent for the necessities of life and will include the grocer, landlord, and the family physician. It will serve as an effective builder of morale by aiding in preserving the self-respect and pardonable pride of veterans who served their country with honor in a national emergency and who, it is understandable, have a natural reluctance against becoming objects of public charity in their declining years.

In theory, Congress has always considered the pension rate as an adjunct to income rather than as supporting income. In this connection, however, many World War I veterans because of advanced age and disability have no other income to support them.

At this point I should like to discuss briefly the situation faced by members of our Armed Forces serving in World War I. At that time, the American doughboy in 1917 received $21 monthly pay which later was increased to $30, with 10 percent additional for oversea service.

There was no family allotment plan as in World War II whereby the Government contributed to the serviceman's deduction from his pay and the total contributions resulted in a family allowance check being mailed monthly to dependents.

In 1917 and 1918 the doughboy was strictly on his own in worrying about the comfort and health of his loved ones, and any so-called allotment could only be paid out of the meager $30 monthly pay he received, as there was no helping hand from Uncle Sam.

When time for discharge arrived, the World War I veteran was given $60 as a separation allowance to assist him in adjusting himself to civilian life.

Mr. Chairman, contrast this treatment with the many fringe benefits made to World War II and Korean veterans in the form of GI home and business loans, mustering-out pay, and unemployment insurance benefits for 52 weeks at the rate of $20 weekly which commonly became known as the 52–20 Club.

In addition, World War II and Korean veterans were given the option of continuing their education in trade schools, colleges, and universities with the cost of tuition, books, and a subsistence allowance for them and their dependents—all paid for by a grateful Government.

Compare these fringe benefits for service in World War II to the $60 separation allowance paid to veterans of World War I—an amount of money that was not sufficient to purchase a good overcoat because, as many will recall, the $60 was received in an era that boasted of high wartime wages accompanied by skyrocketing prices and a craze for silk shirts that cost from $12 to $15 each.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it unmistakably clear that I am not critical of the treatment accorded World War II and Korean veterans because I served in both world conflicts. While I have not found it necessary to avail myself of GI loan and educational benefits provided for my comrades in World War II, I thank God they were made available for those who deserved them as they represent an expression of gratitude by a grateful Government and serve as a measure of compensation for the sacrifices of those who served in America's wars.

My point in comparing the treatment accorded veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea is to emphasize that Congress has been negligent in recognizing the economic plight of the veteran of World War I.

Congress met its responsibility to veterans of the Spanish-American War by approving legislation to pay them and their dependents a reasonable pension and has from time to time granted increases in such benefits.

In like manner the benefits made available to those of us who served in World War II and Korea were not possible until Congress placed its stamp of approval on them.

In all sincerity, I ask, "How much longer are we going to ignore the economic status of the World War I veteran?"

When you search your conscience for an answer keep in mind the paltry $60 separation allowance paid veterans of World War I which in reality was an amount insufficient to purchase a good suit of clothes.

Later you will recall the so-called bonus issue rocked the country because of high unemployment among returned veterans and the absence at that time of any 52–20 clubs to serve as a crutch in adjusting to civilian life.

Finally, the issue was decided by Congress when it overrode President Roosevelt's veto of the adjusted service bonus which was in in the form of 20-year certificates and averaged about $300 per veteran. On the other hand, World War II veterans received mustering-out pay immediately upon discharge, which is further evidence of the disparity in the treatment accorded veterans of the First World War.

It is ironical that many of those in Congress and elsewhere opposing a pension for World War I veterans are themselves veterans of World War II.

Frankly, it is difficult to understand their lack of appreciation for the fact that World War I veterans have been in the frontline of battle since their discharge from service nearly 40 years ago in seeking improvement in hospital and medical care for veterans of our Nation's wars.

In fact, the veteran of World War I has for years been occupied in improving the Government's program of caring for veterans of all wars and pioneered in the struggle to establish what is now the Veterans' Administration as the successor of the old Pension Bureau.

Now at an average age of over 66 the World War I veteran's span of life is nearing the end and it is unthinkable that some of his comrades from World War II are proving to be the most vociferous in urging that any World War I pension bill be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, this traditional policy of our Government was established in the days of George Washington and recognized by Congress which granted service pensions to the veterans of all wars from the days of Valley Forge to and including the Spanish-American War.

Unfortunately, Congress has ignored the World War I veteran while approving various fringe benefits to World War II veterans. The approval of these deserving benefits is proof positive that Congress recognizes military service requires great sacrifices and merits recognition.

But again I ask why ignore the ailing and aged World War I veteran and be guilty of such rank discrimination?

When you stop to consider the merits of my bill, H.R. 3903, keeping in mind that the income limitations make the measure no so-called handout, I am convinced that you will find the legislation worthy of your favorable consideration.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you give thought to the obligation Congress owes to the forgotten veteran of America's wars as revealed by the plight of the ailing and aged indomitable doughboy of 1917 and 1918.

It is my sincere hope that upon the conclusion of these hearings, this committee will find it possible to report H.R. 3903 or one of many similar measures to the House. Such action will prove an important step in wiping out the discrimination that has prevailed against World War I veterans when legislating for the veteran population of the Nation.

Opportunities Lie Ahead for New Coast Guard Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members the commencement address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at 75th commencement exercises of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., on June 7, 1961. Secretary Dillon most ably delineated the role of the Coast Guard in today's highly technical world of advancing cultures and societies, pointing out to the graduating class the challenges and opportunities which lie ahead for the new officers. Secretary Dillon's address follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE 75TH COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1961

Admiral Evans, members of the class of 1961, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is my first visit to the Coast Guard Academy as Secretary of the Treasury. I am honored to participate in this 75th commencement and to address the class of 1961. In a short time you will step up to this platform to receive your bachelor of science diplomas and your commissions as ensigns in the Coast Guard. It is a moment that will climax 4 arduous years of work and study—one you will never forget. You have every reason for pride and satisfaction. But while this day is primarily yours, it also belongs to the country you will serve.

Gentlemen, you are to be congratulated for having chosen a career of service to country and humanity. The path you will follow will not be easy, but the fine training you have received here at the Coast Guard Academy will stand you in good stead in years to come.

You have made an excellent beginning in your professional careers. But commencements, by definition, are primarily beginnings and do not represent final achievement. When you leave this campus today, you will set out on a new and exciting career in one of our oldest and most versatile Armed Forces—a career which offers unparalleled opportunities for service, not only as Coast Guard officers, but also as official representatives of the United States. For, by accepting a commission in the Coast Guard, you will accept the responsibilities of leadership in a profession that will bring you into contact with a worldwide variety of naval, maritime, and commercial affairs.

Leadership is a big word. It will be up to you to give it meaning. Your responsibilities and your opportunities will be greater than those experienced by your predecessors. For your country, which stands before the world as an example of what a free, creative people

can do when given full opportunity for self-expression, is challenged today as never before in its history.

We have indeed been fortunate. A kind providence has blessed us with a fair and fertile land, rich with an abundance of natural gifts and a hard-working, intelligent citizenry. And we have fared well, I think, because there has always been in our people a recognition that there is a Supreme Power not subject to human limitations.

But all our talents and resources will mean nothing unless we bring them to bear as a united people to meet the problems confronting us in the months and the years that lie ahead. Our Founding Fathers understood the situation very well when they wrote 185 years ago: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

A great truth, to be borne constantly in mind, is that these rights cannot and must not be taken for granted. Each generation must struggle anew to maintain them. This struggle takes different forms. The young men of my time had to meet that challenge in the arena of war. It was our deepest hope that out of our ordeal would be born a lasting peace among all nations. Unfortunately, our hopes have not materialized. We still live in a world beset by tension and anxiety.

If by peace we mean simply the absence of large-scale military operations, then the world is technically still at peace. But all the values of our free society are nevertheless under continuing assault by an alien ideology. This assault upon our free way of life is being waged on all levels: political, economic, psychological—and in some areas, even on the paramilitary level.

Since the end of World War II, there has been a great awakening among the underprivileged peoples of the world. This huge surge of human aspiration is a force of inexorable power. Over and over it has been proved that "men do not live by bread alone." They also yearn for the dignity and self-respect of freemen, and they look to us and to other advanced free nations for assistance in realizing their mounting expectations.

You are, therefore, entering upon your duties as officers of the Coast Guard at a time when the world demands more of our country—and our country demands more of you—than ever before. These demands are spiritual as well as material. It is not enough merely to be militarily and economically strong. To win this struggle we must also appeal to the minds and the hearts of men. We must convince them that our free way of life offers a better future for themselves and for their children than the authoritarian system. Our very future as a nation depends in large measure upon your response to this challenge.

You young men will participate in a worldwide effort to achieve greater understanding between nations and their diverse peoples. We of the Treasury are proud of the part your service is playing.

The Coast Guard is uniquely qualified to meet the complex needs of our times because it is both a military service and a humanitarian agency. All of its resources are at the disposal of those who need them, without regard to nationality.

As officers of the Coast Guard you will be members of a service which enjoys high prestige in many parts of the world. Your duties often will bring you into contact with men of many nations in a working partnership. It is on this personal level that you can contribute much to strengthening your country's international relations.

What are some of the opportunities that await you?

One example is the Coast Guard's constant effort to advance standards of maritime safety throughout the world. Last June, largely as a result of the tragic loss of the *Andrea Doria,* an International Conference for the Safety of Life at Sea was held in London under the auspices of the United Nations. At that Conference which was attended by some 500 officials of more than 50 nations, the Coast Guard represented American shipping interests. During the extended negotiations, the U.S. delegation headed by your Commandant, Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, conducted itself with a professional competence that won universal respect and wide support for many U.S. proposals which pointed the way toward greater safety at sea.

Another recent milestone in international collaboration was the Sixth International Technical Conference on Lighthouses and Other Aids to Navigation held last fall in Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the Coast Guard. Forty nations took part in this Conference.

I cite these Conferences to indicate the wide sphere of activity embraced by your service, and to illustrate the kind of duty that may lie ahead of you at the international conference table as you become senior officers. The significance of these Conferences goes far beyond purely technical considerations. They are an important part of our continuing national effort to achieve greater understanding and collaboration with all nations.

One of the most important international aspects of the Coast Guard's work is its program of providing counsel and instruction to help solve the problems of a growing number of other nations. It has aided in establishing organizations similar in purpose and scope to your own service. It has given officials of other governments an opportunity to study at Coast Guard schools, training stations, and installations since the end of World War II. The Coast Guard has been going about this work quietly and competently. Among the many foreign governments which have received assistance from the Coast Guard during the past year alone are Argentina, Brazil, Ceylon, the Republic of China, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey, and Vietnam.

The training program covers a wide variety of subjects, including helicopter rescue techniques, air traffic control, port security, aids to navigation, loran, merchant marine inspection, rescue coordination, and training in the operation of the UF–2 aircraft. This type of intergovernmental cooperation by the Coast Guard is a valuable contribution to maritime safety and the security of the free world. Undoubtedly, some of you will participate in this program, which is becoming increasingly important. From my own experience in international relations, I can assure you that it will be one of the most satisfying experiences of your lifetime.

The humanitarian side of the Coast Guard's work was dramatically brought to the world's attention in 1959, when the Coast Guard cutter *Storis* was dispatched to evacuate an injured seaman from the Soviet refrigerator ship *Pischavaya Industriya* 149 miles from Dutch Harbor, Alaska. After picking up an interpreter and doctor, a Coast Guard plane flew the seaman to the nearby Elmendorf Air Force Base hospital. This incident, one of many, underscores the fact that the Coast Guard's services are available to all ships and persons in peril on the sea, without regard to nationality.

As Coast Guard officers you will have the opportunity to participate in the International Ice Patrol. This outstandingly successful venture in international collaboration was born in 1914, following the tragic sinking of the luxury liner *Titanic.*

Ever since that sad event which cost 1,513 lives, the Coast Guard has been keeping watch over the ice-infested shipping lanes of the North Atlantic.

The Coast Guard is charged with the responsibility for operating the patrol. The cost of its upkeep is presently shared by 16 contributing governments. The fact that the Coast Guard has been entrusted with this heavy international responsibility is another example of the high regard in which the Coast Guard is held by other nations.

In viewing the Coast Guard as part of the world picture, I do not intend in any way to minimize such important functions as maritime law enforcement, port security, or the safeguarding of individual citizens through the small boat safety program. Indeed, as an amateur sailor myself along our New England coast, I have firsthand knowledge of the invaluable service rendered by the Coast Guard to the growing number of Americans who are taking to the water in pleasure craft.

Gentlemen, as you enter upon duty as officers, I think it important for you to bear in mind that whether you serve on our inland waterways or in the Antarctic, you have a tough, but rewarding job ahead of you.

Your 4 years here have been a long, hard voyage, but you have weathered it successfully. In a few minutes, you will raise your right hands to take the traditional oath as commissioned officers of the U.S. Coast Guard. I am confident that you will measure up to the best traditions of the hosts of brave men who preceded you in the service. I have equal confidence that you will acquit yourselves with such distinction that succeeding generations of Coast Guard officers will say "Well done." To all of you, I extend my warmest congratulations. May you all have long, happy, and successful careers in the service of country and humanity.

Hon. Thomas C. Egan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great jurists of the Federal courts who lived in my district until he passed away last week was the Honorable Thomas C. Egan. He and his family lived at 118 East Sedgwick Street in Germantown. His last public office was that of U.S. district court judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. Prior public service included chairmanship of the Philadelphia Gas Commission and membership on the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. Before his elevation to the bench, Tom Egan, as he was affectionately known, practiced law in Philadelphia County for many years.

Judge Egan was born in Pennsylvania in 1894 at Shenandoah. He graduated from Georgetown University and received his LL.B. from the University of

Pennsylvania Law School in 1921. He received honorary degrees from Georgetown University, LL.D., and from St. Joseph's College, L.H.D.

I have known Judge Egan for over 30 years and in all that time have had the highest respect for him as a man, a lawyer, and as a judge. He was extremely friendly and pleasant to everyone. Philadelphia has lost an outstanding citizen. The Federal courts have lost a great jurist.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, we pause this dedicated moment to acknowledge that deeper than all else we are Thy children, and that supreme over every allegiance is our rightful loyalty to Thee.

Behold us here, in this historic forum, seeking in a common prayer light upon our ways and strength within our hearts.

We would dedicate ourselves anew to the building of a decent, humane, lawabiding world to which Thy reign shall come and Thy will be done.

To this end give us a vision splendid of a unified world which denies the divisive heresy that east is east, and west is west, and never the twain shall meet.

As this day, in this shrine of freedom, Western and Eastern hands are clasped in enduring friendship, and in mutual allegiance to the liberty and dignity of the individual under all skies, may there be strengthened and expanded bridges of understanding and cooperation which shall tie together in a resistless crusade peoples and lands, one in heart, though they be half a world away.

Give us the grace to be done with the tragic trifles which divide Thy children on this earth and to say, and to mean—

Join hands then, brothers of the faith,
Whate'er your race may be;
Who serves my Father as a son
Is truly kin to me.

We ask it in the name of the Elder Brother of us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 11, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7265) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia so as to provide a new basis for determining certain marital property rights, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7265) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia so as to provide a new basis for determining certain marital property rights, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conjunction with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I suggest the absence of a quorum, before the Senate proceeds to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY MOHAMMAD AYUB KHAN, PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of attending a joint meeting of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by Mohammad Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan.

(For the address delivered by the President of Pakistan, see House proceedings in today's RECORD.)

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair).

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEEDED: EXPANDED SHIPBUILDING ON THE GREAT LAKES—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, creating America's fourth seacoast, necessitates taking a new look at the commercial and defense potential of the Great Lakes region.

Recognizing its new status, I believe there is a real need for greater effort, not only to step up flow of trade and commerce, but also to expand shipbuilding and other maritime activities to meet the needs of the times.

Today, I was privileged to receive from Mayor Lawrence M. Hagen, of Superior, Wis., a resolution by Alderman Thomas Thompson petitioning the Federal Government for assistance in securing shipbuilding contracts for the city of Superior.

In my judgment, this fine community is superbly qualified for such work and for making a real contribution in this field.

I shall, of course, take the matter up with the appropriate agencies. However, I felt it important, once again, to bring to the attention of the Senate, these special challenges, as well as the fast-growing economic significance of the Great Lakes region to the economy of the country.

I request unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY ALDERMAN THOMAS THOMPSON PETITIONING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR ASSISTANCE IN SECURING SHIPBUILDING CONTRACTS FOR THE CITY OF SUPERIOR

Whereas the city of Superior is ideally situated and equipped for the construction of ships; and

Whereas Superior has been determined to be located in a federally designated distressed area; and

Whereas the securing of additional contracts for the construction of ships would greatly enhance the economic conditions in the city of Superior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Superior, That the Federal Government be requested to lend all assistance possible in the securing and awarding of shipbuilding contracts to shipbuilding firms located within the city of Superior; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and Congressman ALVIN O'KONSKI.

Passed and adopted this 26th day of June 1961.

Approved this 27th day of June 1961.

LAWRENCE M. HAGEN,
Mayor.

Attest:

R. E. MCKEAGUE,
City Clerk.